arXiv:1507.04669v1 [math.AC] 16 Jul 2015

CONSTRUCTING EXAMPLES OF SEMIGROUPS OF VALUATIONS

OLGA KASHCHEYEVA

Abstract. We work with rational rank 1 valuations centered in regular local rings. Given an algebraic function field K of transcendence degree 3 over k, a regular local ring R with $QF(R) = K$ and a k-valuation ν of K, we provide an algorithm for constructing a generating sequences for ν in R. We then develop a method for determining a valuation ν on $k(x, y, z)$ through the sequence of defining values. Using the above results we construct examples of valuations centered in $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ and investigate their semigroups of values.

1. Introduction

This paper is inspired by the following question: given a regular local noetherian domain R and a valuation ν of the field of fractions $QF(R)$ dominating R, what semigroups can appear as a value semigroup $\nu(R)$. The answer is available when R is of dimension 1 or 2, but little is known for higher dimensional regular local rings.

The only semigroups which are realized by a valuation on a one dimensional regular local ring are isomorphic to the semigroup of natural numbers. The semigroups which are realized by a valuation on a regular local ring of dimension 2 with algebraically closed residue field are completely classified by Spivakovsky in [14]. A different proof for power series ring in two variables over $\mathbb{C}$ is given by Favre and Jonsson in [6]. In [5], Cutkosky and Vinh give a necessary and sufficient condition for a semigroup S to be the semigroup of a valuation dominating a regular local ring R of dimension 2 with a prescribed residue field extension. In the context of semigroups under the assumption that the rational rank of ν is 1 the criterion is as follows, see [3], [2], Corollary 3.3, and [5].

Let S be a well ordered subsemigroup of $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ with at most countable system of generators $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ such that $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \cdots < \beta_n < \ldots$. For all $i \geq 0$ let $G_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta_j \mathbb{Z}$ and $q_{i+1} = [G_{i+1} : G_i] = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | q\beta_{i+1} \in G_i\}$. Then S is the semigroup of a valuation ν dominating a regular local ring R of dimension 2 if and only if $\beta_{i+1} > q_i\beta_i$ for all $i \geq 1$

In particular, it follows that an ordered minimal set of generators $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of the value semigroup of a valuation dominating a regular local ring of dimension 2 is sparse as $\beta_{i+1} > 2\beta_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. This property does not stand true for higher dimensional regular local rings as shown by example in [2].

When dimension of R is n the classical results, see [18], state that the value semigroup $\nu(R)$ is isomorphic to a well ordered set contained in the nonnegative part of $(\mathcal{R}^h, <_{lex})$ and having an ordinal type of at most ω^h. Here, ω is the first infinite ordinal and h is the rank of ν; h is less than or equal to the rational rank of ν, which is less than or equal to n. Additional bound on the growth of rank 1 valuation semigroups is found by Cutkosky in [1]. It leads to a construction of a well ordered subsemigroup of $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ of ordinal type ω, which is not a value semigroup of a noetherian local domain. In [4], Cutkosky and Teissier formulate bounds on the growth of the number of distinct valuation ideals of R corresponding to values lying in certain parts of the value group of ν, thus extending to all ranks the bound given for rank 1 valuations in [1]. They also provide some surprising examples of semigroups of rank greater than 1 that occur as semigroups of valuations on noetherian domains, see [4] and [3]. In [13], Moghaddam constructs a certain class of value semigroups with large rational rank.

In this paper we use the approach of generating sequences of valuations to investigate value semigroups of valuations centered in 3-dimensional regular local rings. Let (R, m_R) be a local ring and K be its field of fractions. Let ν be a valuation on K with valuation ring (V, m_V). Assume that $R \subset V$ and $m_R = m_V \cap R$. Let $\Phi_R = \nu(R\backslash\{0\})$ be the semigroup consisting of the values of nonzero elements of R. For $\gamma \in \Phi_R$, let $I_\gamma = \{f \in R \mid \ \nu(f) \geq \gamma\}$ and $I_\gamma^+ = \{f \in R \mid \ \nu(f) > \gamma\}$. A (possibly infinite) sequence $\{Q_i\}$ of elements of R is a *generating sequence* of ν if for every $\gamma \in \Phi_R$ the ideal I_γ is generated by the set

$$\{\prod_i {Q_i}^{b_i} \mid \ b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \ \sum_i b_i \nu(Q_i) \geq \gamma\}.$$

Notice that the set of values $\{\nu(Q_i)\}$ generates Φ_R as a semigroup. Moreover, the set of images of Q_i in the associated graded ring of valuation $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R = \bigoplus_{\gamma\in\Phi} I_\gamma/I_\gamma^+$ generate $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ as R/m_R-algebra. The graded ring $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ is of particular interest as it is a key tool used by Teissier in [15] and [16] to solve the local uniformization problem. When the valuation is rational, that is $V/m_V = R/m_R$, the graded ring $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ is isomorphic to the semigroup algebra over R/m_R of the value semigroup Φ_R, it can be represented as the quotient of a polynomial algebra by a prime binomial ideal, (see [16]).

In section 2 we provide an algorithm for constructing generating sequences of rational rank 1 valuations when K is an algebraic function field of transcendence degree 3 over an algebraically closed field k and R is a regular local ring containing k. In the construction we denote the sequence $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ and call it the sequence of jumping polynomials. We then show that $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ is a generating sequence of valuation in section 4. This construction extends the construction of generating sequences in two dimensional regular local rings used in [7].

The algorithm is recursive and explicit equations for P_{i+1} in terms of $\{P_j\}_{0\leq j\leq i}$ and for $T_{\bar{d}(i)}$ in terms of $\{P_j\}_{0\leq j\leq m_i} \cup \{T_j\}_{0<j\leq i}$ are provided. These equations are binomial in nature with the value of the term on the left strictly greater than the

value of each term on the right

$$P_{i+1} = P_i^{q_i} - \lambda_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}$$

$$T_{\bar{d}} = T_i^{c_i s_i} \prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j} - \mu_{\bar{d}} \prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}$$

Here, $\bar{d}$ is an integer greater than or equal to $i+1$, $\lambda_i, \mu_{\bar{d}} \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $n_{i,j}$, m_i, a_j, c_j, $n_{\bar{d},j}$, $l_{\bar{d},j}$ are nonnegative integers and q_i, c_i, s_i are positive integers determined by the algorithm. In the given set up the associated graded ring of valuation $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ is the quotient of a polynomial algebra in infinitely many variables $k[\{P_i\}_i, \{T_i\}_i]$ by the binomial ideal $(\{P_i^{q_i} - \lambda_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}\}_i, \{T_i^{c_i s_i} \prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j} - \mu_{\bar{d}} \prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}\}_{\bar{d}})$.

In order to construct examples of semigroups of valuations we work with polynomial rings in three variables $k[x, y, z]$ over an arbitrary base field k. We use the approach of extending the trivial valuation of k to a valuation of $k(x, y, z)$ through the sequence of augmented valuations determined by a sequence of defining polynomials as we call them in the construction of section 5. The technique of sequences of augmented valuations and key polynomials was first introduced by MacLane in [10] in order to describe all possible extensions of a discrete rank one valuation μ of a field L to the field $L(\xi)$. In [17], Vaquié generalized MacLane's axiomatic method to produce all extensions of an arbitrary valuation of a field L to a pseudo-valuation of $L(\xi)$. A different, more constructive, approach to describe and generalize key polynomials of MacLane was taken by Herrera Govantes, Olalla Acosta, Mahboub and Spivakovsky in [8] and [9], see also [11]. The construction of section 5 is most closely related to the construction of key polynomials used in [6] by Favre and Jonsson in order to describe $\mathbb{C}$-valuations on $\mathbb{C}(x, y)$. We note that we do not apply the terminology of key polynomials and augmented valuations when working with defining polynomials.

The sequence of defining polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i \geq 0} \cup \{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ constructed in section 5 is contained in the ring $k[x, y, z]$. These polynomials are completely determined by the following numerical input:

– sequence of positive rational numbers $\{\beta_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ such that $\beta_{i+1} > q_i \beta_i$
– sequence of positive rational numbers $\{\bar{\gamma}_i\}_{i>0}$ such that $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} > \bar{r}_{i,0}\beta_0 + \bar{s}_i \bar{\gamma}_i$
– sequences of nonzero scalars $\{\lambda_i\}_{i>0}$ and $\{\bar{\mu}_i\}_{i>0}$ in k

Here, β_i is the prescribed value for P_i, $\bar{\gamma}_i$ is the prescribed value for Q_i, $q_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | q\beta_i \in \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \beta_j \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\bar{s}_i = \min\{s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | s\bar{\gamma}_i \in (\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta_j \mathbb{Z} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{\gamma}_j \mathbb{Z})\}$ and $\bar{r}_{i,0}$ is a nonnegative integer described in the construction of section 5. Explicit recursive equations for P_{i+1} in terms of $\{P_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq i}$ and for Q_{i+1} in terms of $\{P_j\}_{j \geq 0} \cup \{Q_j\}_{0<j \leq i}$

are provided. They are binomial equations

$$P_{i+1}=P_i^{q_i}-\lambda_i\prod_{j=0}^{i-1}P_j^{n_{i,j}}$$

$$Q_{i+1}=x^{\bar{r}_{i,0}}Q_i^{\bar{s}_i}-\bar{\mu}_i\prod_{j=0}^{\bar{m}_i}P_j^{\bar{n}_{i,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}Q_j^{\bar{l}_{i,j}}$$

Here, $\bar{m}_i$ and $n_{i,j}, \bar{n}_{i,j}, \bar{l}_{i,j}$ are nonnegative integers determined by the construction of section 5.

It is shown in section 6 that provided infinitely many q_i and $\bar{s}_i$ are greater than 1 the numerical data above uniquely determines a valuation on $k(x,y,z)$. In particular, (P_0,β_0) determines a discrete valuation on $k(x)$. Polynomials $\{(P_i,\beta_i)\}_{i>0}$ determine the extension of the discrete valuation of $k(x)$ to $k(x,y)$ and $\{(Q_i,\bar{\gamma}_i)\}_{i>0}$ determine the extension of the valuation of $k(x,y)$ to $k(x,y,z)$. Polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i>0}$ are monic polynomials in $k(x)[y]$, see Proposition 6.1. Polynomials $\{Q_i,\}_{i>0}$ are not in general monic polynomials in $k(x,y)[z]$, see Proposition 6.3 and Corollary 6.4. We note that in MacLane's construction key polynomials are monic polynomials in $L[\xi]$, however there is no restriction on the lower degree terms of key polynomials except that the coefficients are elements of L. In our construction coefficients of P_i are elements of the ring $k[x]$ and coefficients of Q_i are elements of the ring $k[x,y]$.

In sections 7 and 8 we provide examples of semigroups of valuations centered in $k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)}$. We use defining polynomials to construct a valuation and then work with the sequence of jumping polynomials to describe its value semigroup. One of the examples shows that when the set $\{\bar{r}_{i,0}|\bar{r}_{i,0}>0\}$ is empty the generators of the value semigroup are the values of defining polynomials $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}\cup\{\bar{\gamma}\}_{i>0}$. In our main example, section 7, only one member of the sequence $\{\bar{r}_{i,0}\}_{i\geq 0}$ is greater than 0. Finally, in the last example we set $\bar{r}_{1,0}$ and $\bar{r}_{2,0}$ greater than 0. Already in the case of just two $\bar{r}_{i,0}$ greater than zero the pattern for the sequence of generators of the value semigroup becomes quite complicated.

2. Construction of jumping polynomials

We assume that k is an algebraically closed field and K is an algebraic function field of transcendence degree 3 over k. ν is a k-valuation of K with valuation ring (V,m_V) and value group Γ. We assume that ν is of rational rank 1 and dimension 0, so that Γ is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}$ and $V/m_V=k$. (R,m_R) is a local subring of K with $k\subset R$ and $R_{(0)}=K$. We assume that R is a regular ring with regular parameters x,y,z. We also assume that R is dominated by ν, that is $R\subset V$ and $R\cap m_V=m_R$.

We use the following notations. Let $a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_k$ be nonnegative integers and a be a positive integer. If $M=x_1^{a_1}x_2^{a_2}\cdots x_k^{a_k}$ is a monomial in $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_k$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is a set of monomials in (infinitely many) variables $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_k,x_{k+1},\ldots$ then M is said to be irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{X}$ if $x_1^{b_1}x_2^{b_2}\cdots x_k^{b_k}\notin\mathcal{X}$ for all $b_1,b_2,\ldots,b_k\in$

$\mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 \leq b_i \leq a_i$. If Φ is a semigroup with a fixed set of generators $\{\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_k\}$ and $\mu \in (\Phi + (-\Phi))$ we say that $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k, a)$ is reduced with respect to $(\Phi, \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k\}, \mu)$, or (Φ, μ) for short, if $a_1\mu_1 + a_2\mu_2 + \cdots + a_k\mu_k + a\mu \in \Phi$ and $b_1\mu_1 + b_2\mu_2 + \cdots + b_k\mu_k + b\mu \notin \Phi$ for all $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 < b \leq a$, $0 \leq b_i \leq a_i$ and $(\sum_{i=1}^k b_i + b) < (\sum_{i=1}^k a_i + a)$.

To construct a generating sequence of ν in R we define a sequence of jumping polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ in R.

Let $P_0 = x,\ P_1 = y$ and $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}_1 = \emptyset$. For all $i \geq 0$ we set $\beta_i = \nu(P_i)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_i &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^i \beta_j \mathbb{Z} \\ S_i &= \textstyle\sum_{j=0}^i \beta_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

For all $i > 0$ let $q_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \,|\, q\beta_i \in G_{i-1}\}$. Set $\mathcal{P}_{i+1} = \mathcal{P}_i \cup \{P_i^{q_i}\}$. Let $n_{i,0}, n_{i,1}, \ldots, n_{i,i-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be such that $q_i\beta_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} n_{i,j}\beta_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{P}_i$. Denote by λ_i the residue of $P_i^{q_i}/\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}$ in V/m_V and set

$$P_{i+1} = P_i^{q_i} - \lambda_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}.$$

Finally set $G = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty G_i$, $S = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty S_i$ and $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty \mathcal{P}_i$.

Remark 2.1. The infinite sequence $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ is well defined due to the following

1. $P_i \neq 0$ and $\beta_i < \infty$ for all $i > 0$. (See Proposition 4.1)
2. $\beta_{i+1} > q_i\beta_i$ for all $i > 0$.
3. $\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{P}_i$ if and only if $n_{i,j} < q_j$ for all $j > 0$.
4. $n_{i,0}, n_{i,1}, \ldots, n_{i,i-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is a unique i-tuple of integers satisfying the conditions $q_i\beta_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} n_{i,j}\beta_j$ and $n_{i,j} < q_j$ for all $j > 0$. (See Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.3.)
5. $\lambda_i \in k\backslash\{0\}$ for all $i > 0$.

Let $T_1 = z$, $m_0 = 0$, $\delta_0 = 1$, $\mathcal{T}_1 = \mathcal{P}$, $H_0 = \{0\}$ and $U_0 = \{0\}$. For all $i > 0$ such that $T_i \neq 0$ we set $\gamma_i = \nu(T_i)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_i &= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^i \gamma_j \mathbb{Z} \\ U_i &= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^i \gamma_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

For all $i > 0$ such that $T_i \neq 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &= \min\{s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid s\gamma_i \in (H_{i-1} + G)\} \\ m_i &= \max(m_{i-1}, \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid s_i\gamma_i \in (H_{i-1} + G_j)\}). \end{aligned}$$

For all $i > 0$ such that $T_i \neq 0$ consider the following sets of $(m_i + 1 + i)$-tuples of nonnegative integers

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_i = \{ \quad & \bar{d} = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{m_i}, c_1, \ldots, c_{i-1}, c_i) \mid \bar{d} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^{m_i+1+i}, c_i > 0, \\ & \bar{d} \text{ is reduced with respect to } ((S_{m_i} + U_{i-1}), s_i\gamma_i), \\ & \textstyle\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j} \text{ is irreducible with respect to } \mathcal{T}_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\delta_i = \#\mathcal{D}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_i \cup \{T_i^{c_i s_i}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j} \mid \bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i\}$. If $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i$ denote $|\bar{d}| = \sum_{j=0}^{m_i} a_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} c_j\gamma_j + c_i s_i\gamma_i$. We assume that $\mathcal{D}_i = \{\bar{d}_1, \bar{d}_2, \ldots, \bar{d}_{\delta_i}\}$ is an ordered set with $|\bar{d}_1| \le |\bar{d}_2| \le \cdots \le |\bar{d}_{\delta_i}|$. If $\bar{d} = \bar{d}_k$ for some $1 \le k \le \delta_i$ let $n_{\bar{d},0}, n_{\bar{d},1}, \ldots, n_{\bar{d},m_i}, l_{\bar{d},1}, l_{\bar{d},2}, \ldots, l_{\bar{d},i-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ be such that $|\bar{d}| = \sum_{j=0}^{m_i} n_{\bar{d},j}\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} l_{\bar{d},j}\gamma_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$. Denote by $\mu_{\bar{d}}$ the residue of $(T_i^{c_i s_i}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j})/(\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}}\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}})$ in V/m_V and set

$$T_{(\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\delta_j)+k} = T_{\bar{d}} = T_i^{c_i s_i}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j} - \mu_{\bar{d}}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}}\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}.$$

For all $i > 0$ such that $T_i = 0$ set $\gamma_i = 0$, $H_i = H_{i-1}$, $U_i = U_{i-1}$, $s_i = 1$, $m_i = m_{i-1}$, $\mathcal{D}_i = \emptyset$, $\delta_i = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_i \cup \{T_i\}$. Finally set $H = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} H_i$, $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} U_i$ and $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{T}_i$.

Remark 2.2. The sequence $\{T_i\}_{i\ge 1}$ is well defined due to the following

1. $\delta_i < \infty$ for all $i > 0$. (See Lemma 4.2.)
2. If $i, k > 0$ then $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if it is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$.
3. If $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i$ for some $i > 0$ then $n_{\bar{d},0}, n_{\bar{d},1}, \ldots, n_{\bar{d},m_i}, l_{\bar{d},1}, l_{\bar{d},2}, \ldots, l_{\bar{d},i-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ is a unique $(m_i + i)$-tuple of integers satisfying the conditions $|\bar{d}| = \sum_{j=0}^{m_i} n_{\bar{d},j}\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} l_{\bar{d},j}\gamma_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. (See Proposition 4.3.)
4. $\mu_{\bar{d}} \in k\backslash\{0\}$ for all $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i$ and all $i > 0$.
5. It may happen that $T_{\bar{d}} = 0$ for some i and $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i$. (See example 8.2)

For $i, j > 0$ we say that T_j is an immediate successor of T_i and T_i is an immediate predecessor of T_j if $T_j = T_{\bar{d}}$ for some $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_i$. We say that T_j is a successor of T_i if there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and a sequence of integers $l_0, l_1, \ldots, l_k$ such that $l_0 = i$, $l_k = j$ and T_{l_t} is an immediate successor of $T_{l_{t-1}}$ for all $1 \le t \le k$. Notice that if $T_k \ne 0$ is an immediate successor of T_i then $\gamma_k > s_i\gamma_i$.

We say that T_i is redundant if $T_i = 0$ or the following conditions are satisfied: $\nu(T_i) \in (S_{m_i} + U_{i-1})$, T_i has a finite number of nonzero successors and the only immediate successor $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j}$ of T_i is redundant.

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In this section we prove several arithmetical statements needed to justify the construction of jumping polynomials in section 2 as well as construction of defining polynomials in section 5. So we assume that $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\ge 0}$ and $\{\gamma'_i\}_{i>0}$ are sequences of rational numbers but not necessarily values of jumping polynomials. As above we set

$m'_0 = 0$, $G'_0 = \beta'_0\mathbb{Z}$, $H'_0 = \{0\}$ and for all $i > 0$ we set

$$S'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad G'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad S' = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} S'_j, \quad G' = \bigcup_{j=0}^{infty} G'_j$$

$$U'_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \gamma'_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad H'_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \gamma'_j \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad U' = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U'_j, \quad H' = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} H'_j$$

$$q'_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid q\beta'_i \in G'_{i-1}\}, \qquad s'_i = \min\{s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid s\gamma'_i \in (H'_{i-1} + G')\}$$

$$\text{and} \quad m'_i = \max(m'_{i-1}, \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid s'_i\gamma'_i \in (H'_{i-1} + G'_j)\})$$

We notice that if $i > 0$ and $k \geq m'_i$ then $G'_i = \frac{1}{q'_i} G'_{i-1}$ and $(G'_k + H'_i) = \frac{1}{s'_i}(G'_k + H'_{i-1})$ so that $(G'_k + H'_i) = (\prod_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{s'_j}) G'_k = (\prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{q'_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{s'_j}) G'_0$. Therefore, if $i \geq 0$ and $k > m'_i$ then $(G'_k + H'_i) = \frac{1}{q'_k}(G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $\alpha \in (G'_k + H'_i)$ for some $i, k \geq 0$. Then there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a unique $(m+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_1, \dots, n_m, l_1, \dots, l_i)$ such that $m = max(k, m'_i)$, $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{m} n_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma'_j$ and $n_j < q'_j$, $l_j < s'_j$ for all $j > 0$.*

Proof. We first observe that if i is fixed and $k \leq m'_i$ then $\alpha \in (G'_k + H'_i)$ implies $\alpha \in (G'_{m_i} + H'_i)$ whereas the conclusion of the lemma does not depend on k. Thus, it is enough to show that the statement holds for all $i \geq 0$ and $k \geq m'_i$.

We use induction on (i, k). If $i = 0$ and $k = m'_0 = 0$ then the statement is trivial. Assume that i is fixed and $k > m'_i$. Then since $(G'_k + H'_i) = \frac{1}{q'_k}(G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$ and β'_k generates $(G'_k + H'_i)$ over $(G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$ we can write

$$(G'_k + H'_i) = (G'_{k-1} + H'_i) \cup (\beta'_k + G'_{k-1} + H'_i) \cup \cdots \cup ((q'_k - 1)\beta'_k + G'_{k-1} + H'_i),$$

where the union on the right is a disjoint union of $(G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$-sets. There exists a unique nonnegative integer $n_k < q'_k$ such that $\alpha \in (n_k\beta'_k + G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$. Using the inductive hypothesis for $(\alpha - n_k\beta'_k) \in (G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$ we find $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a $(k-1+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}, l_1, \dots, l_i)$ such that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma'_j$ and $n_j < q'_j$, $l_j < s'_j$for all $j > 0$.

To check that such representation is unique assume that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n'_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l'_j\gamma'_j$ is another representation satisfying the requirements of the lemma. Then $0 \leq n'_k < q'_k$ and $(\alpha - n'_k\beta'_k) \in (G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$. On the other hand n_k is the unique integer such that $0 \leq n_k < q'_k$ and $\alpha \in (n_k\beta'_k + G'_{k-1} + H'_i)$, thus, $n'_k = n_k$. Then by the inductive hypothesis applied to $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma'_j = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n'_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l'_j\gamma'_j$ we have $n'_0 = n_0$ and $n'_j = n_j$, $l'_j = l_j$ for all $j > 0$.

Assume now that $i > 0$ and $k = m'_i$. Then since $(G'_k + H'_i) = \frac{1}{s'_i}(G'_k + H'_{i-1})$ and γ'_i generates $(G'_k + H'_i)$ over $(G'_k + H'_{i-1})$ we can write

$$(G'_k + H'_i) = (G'_k + H'_{i-1}) \cup (\gamma'_i + G'_k + H'_{i-1}) \cup \cdots \cup ((s'_i - 1)\gamma'_i + G'_k + H'_{i-1}),$$

where the union on the right is a disjoint union of $(G'_k + H'_{i-1})$-sets. Let $l_i < s'_i$ be a nonnegative integer such that $\alpha \in (l_i\gamma'_i + G'_k + H'_{i-1})$. Using the inductive hypothesis for $(\alpha - l_i\gamma'_i) \in (G'_k + H'_{i-1})$ we find $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a $(k+i-1)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_1, \dots, n_k, l_1, \dots, l_{i-1})$ such that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma'_j$ and $n_j < q'_j$, $l_j < s'_j$ for all $j > 0$. We deduce that such representation is unique using an argument similar to the one above. □

The next statement is a straight forward consequence of Lemma 3.1.

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that* $(a_0, \dots, a_k, c_1, \dots, c_i)$, $(b_0, \dots, b_k, d_1, \dots, d_i)$ *are* $(k+1+i)$*-tuples of nonnegative integers such that* $a_j, b_j < q'_j$ *and* $c_j, d_j < s'_j$ *for all* $j > 0$.

If $(a_0, \dots, a_k, c_1, \dots, c_i) \neq (b_0, \dots, b_k, d_1, \dots, d_i)$ *then* $\sum_{j=0}^{k} a_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} c_j\gamma'_j \neq \sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} d_j\gamma'_j$.

We find a sufficient condition for positivity of n_0 by putting additional assumptions on the sequence of rational numbers $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$.

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that the sequence* $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ *satisfies* $\beta'_{i+1} > q'_i\beta'_i$ *for all* $i > 0$ *and* $\beta'_0 > 0$. *Suppose that* $k > 0$ *and* $\alpha \in G'_k$ *is such that* $\alpha \geq q'_k\beta'_k$.

Let $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n_j\beta'_j$ *be the representation given by Lemma 3.1 then* $n_0 > 0$.

Proof. Since $q'_j\beta'_j < \beta_{j+1}$ and $(n_j + 1) \leq q'_j$ for all $j > 0$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j\beta'_j < q'_1\beta'_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{k} n_j\beta'_j < q'_2\beta_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} n_j\beta'_j < \cdots < q'_{k-1}\beta'_{k-1} + n_k\beta'_k < q'_k\beta'_k.$$

If $\alpha \geq q'_k\beta'_k$ this implies that $n_0\beta'_0 \geq q'_k\beta'_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j\beta'_j > 0$. Thus $n_0 > 0$. □

4. PROPERTIES OF JUMPING POLYNOMIALS

In this section we show that the sequence of jumping polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ as constructed above is well defined and is a generating sequence of ν in R.

We use notation of section 2. If A is a commutative ring and $h \in A$ we define $h^0 = 1$, in particular, $h^0 = 1$ when $h = 0$. If $f \in A[y] \setminus \{0\}$ then $\deg_y f$ and $\operatorname{lead}_y f$ denote the degree and leading coefficient of f as a polynomial in y with coefficients in A.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that* $A = k[x]$ *and* $i \geq 1$. *Then* P_i *is a monic polynomial in* $A[y]$ *and* $\deg_y P_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j$. *In particular,* $P_i \neq 0$ *for all* $i > 0$.

Proof. We use induction on i. For $i = 1$ we have $P_1 = y$ is monic of degree 1. Let $i > 1$ then $P_i = P_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} - \lambda_{i-1} \prod_{j=0}^{i-2} P_j^{n_{i,j}}$. By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\deg_y P_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\deg_y\Big(\prod_{j=0}^{i-2} P_j^{n_{i-1,j}}\Big) &= n_{i-1,1} + n_{i-1,2}q_1 + \cdots + n_{i-1,i-2}q_1 \cdots q_{i-3} \\ &< q_1 + (q_2 - 1)q_1 + \cdots + (q_{i-2} - 1)q_1 \cdots q_{i-3} = q_1 \cdots q_{i-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\deg_y P_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j$ and $\operatorname{lead}_y P_i = \operatorname{lead}_y P_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} = 1$. □

The next two statements show that the subsequence of jumping polynomials $\{T_i\}_{i>0}$ is well defined.

Lemma 4.2. *If $i > 0$ then $\delta_i < \infty$.*

Proof. Fix $j > 0$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} F_{j,0} &= \{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (r\beta_0 + s_j\gamma_j) \in (S_{m_j} + U_{j-1})\} \\ F_j &= \{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid r s_j \gamma_j \in (S_{m_j} + U_{j-1})\} \end{aligned}$$

F_j and $F_{j,0}$ are nonempty sets since $(G_{m_j} + H_{j-1}) \cap (N, \infty) = (S_{m_j} + U_{j-1}) \cap (N, \infty)$ when $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ is big enough. Let $r_{j,0} = \min(F_{j,0})$ and $r_j = \min(F_j)$ then $(r_{j,0}, 0, \ldots, 0, 1), (0, \ldots, 0, r_j) \in \mathcal{D}_j$ and therefore $x^{r_{j,0}} T_j^{s_j}, T_j^{r_j s_j} \in \mathcal{T}_i$ for all $i > j$.

Let $i > 0$ and $\bar{d} = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{m_i}, c_1, \ldots, c_{i-1}, c_i) \in \mathcal{D}_i$. Since $\prod_{j=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$ we get that $a_j < q_j$ for all $j > 0$ and $c_j < r_j s_j$ for all $j < i$. Also $a_0 \leq r_{i,0}$ and $c_i \leq r_i$ since $\bar{d}$ is reduced with respect to $((S_{m_i} + U_{i-1}), s_i\gamma_i)$. Thus $\delta_i \leq (r_{i,0} + 1)q_1 \cdots q_{m_i} r_1 s_1 \cdots r_{i-1} s_{i-1} r_i$. □

From now on for all $i > 0$ we fix the notation for r_i as introduced in the proof of Proposition 4.2

$$r_i = \min\{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid r s_i \gamma_i \in (S_{m_i} + U_{i-1})\}.$$

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $\alpha \in (S_k + U_i)$ for some $k, i \geq 0$. Then there exists a unique $(m + 1 + i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_0, \ldots, n_m, l_1, \ldots, l_i)$ such that $m = \max(m_i, k)$, $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{m} n_j \beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j \gamma_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. We first observe that if i is fixed and $k \leq m_i$ then $\alpha \in (S_k + U_i)$ implies $\alpha \in (S_{m_i} + U_i)$ whereas the conclusion of the lemma does not depend on k. Thus, it is enough to show that the statement holds for all $i \geq 0$ and $k \geq m_i$. We use induction on (i, k). If $i = 0$ and $k = m_0 = 0$ then the statement is trivial.

Assume that i is fixed and $k > m_i$. Then since β_k generates $(S_k + U_i)$ over $(S_{k-1} + U_i)$ and $q_k\beta_k \in (S_{k-1} + U_i)$ we can write

$$(S_k + U_i) = (S_{k-1} + U_i) \cup (\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i) \cup \cdots \cup ((q_k - 1)\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i) \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover, if $(a_1\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i) \cap (a_2\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i) \neq \emptyset$ for some nonnegative integers $a_1 < a_2 < q_k$, then we have $(a_2 - a_1)\beta_k \in (G_{k-1} + H_i)$ with $(a_2 - a_1) > 0$. Thus $(a_2 - a_1)$ is a multiple of q_k. This contradicts the assumption that $a_2 < q_k$. Therefore the union on the right of (4.1) is a disjoint union of $(S_{k-1} + U_i)$-sets.

There exists a unique nonnegative integer $n_k < q_k$ such that $\alpha \in (n_k\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i)$. Using the inductive hypothesis for $(\alpha - n_k\beta_k) \in (S_{k-1} + U_i)$ we find a $(k+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}, l_1, \dots, l_i)$ such that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. It remains to check that $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.

Denote $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ by M and $\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ by M_1, also if $t > 0$ and $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_t$ denote the components of $\bar{d}$ by $(a_0, \dots, a_{m_t}, c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}, c_t)$. We notice that M is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{P}$ since M_1 is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{P}$ and $n_k < q_k$. Also if $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_t$ for some $t > i$ then since M does not have T_t in it, M is irreducible with respect to the subset $\{T_t^{c_t s_t} \prod_{j=0}^{m_t} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{t-1} T_j^{c_j}\}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{t+1}$ corresponding to $\bar{d}$. Finally if $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_t$ for some $t \leq i$ then since $k > m_i \geq m_t$ and therefore $\{T_t^{c_t s_t} \prod_{j=0}^{m_t} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{t-1} T_j^{c_j}\}$ does not have P_k in it, M is reducible with respect to the subset $\{T_t^{c_t s_t} \prod_{j=0}^{m_t} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{t-1} T_j^{c_j}\}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{t+1}$ corresponding to $\bar{d}$ if and only if M_1 is reducible with respect to this subset. Thus we deduce that M is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ as required.

To check that such representation is unique we use the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1. Assume that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n'_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l'_j\gamma_j$ is another representation satisfying the requirements of the proposition. Then $0 \leq n'_k < q_k$ and $(\alpha - n'_k\beta_k) \in (S_{k-1} + U_i)$. On the other hand n_k is the unique integer such that $0 \leq n_k < q_k$ and $\alpha \in (n_k\beta_k + S_{k-1} + U_i)$, thus, $n'_k = n_k$. Then by the inductive hypothesis since $\alpha - n_k\beta_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n'_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l'_j\gamma_j$ we have $n'_j = n_j$ and $l'_j = l_j$ for all j.

Assume now that $i > 0$ and $k = m_i$. Since γ_i generates $(S_k + U_i)$ over $(S_k + U_{i-1})$ and $r_i s_i \gamma_i \in (S_k + U_{i-1})$ we can write

$$(S_k + U_i) = (S_k + U_{i-1}) \cup (\gamma_i + S_k + U_{i-1}) \cup \cdots \cup ((r_i s_i - 1)\gamma_i + S_k + U_{i-1}),$$

where the union of $(S_k + U_{i-1})$-sets on the right does not have to be a disjoint union any more. Let $l_i < r_i s_i$ be the minimal nonnegative integer such that $\alpha \in (l_i\gamma_i + S_k + U_{i-1})$. Using the inductive hypothesis for $(\alpha - l_i\gamma_i) \in (S_k + U_{i-1})$ we find a $(k+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_0, \dots, n_k, l_1, \dots, l_{i-1})$ such that $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{k} n_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma_j$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. It remains to check that $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.

Denote $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ by M and $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_j}$ by M_1, also if $t > 0$ and $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_t$ denote the components of $\bar{d}$ by $(a_0, \dots, a_{m_t}, c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}, c_t)$. We notice that M is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$ since M_1 is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$. Also if $\bar{d} \in \mathcal{D}_t$ for some $t > i$ then since M does not have T_t in it, M is irreducible with respect to the subset $\{T_t^{c_ts_t}\prod_{j=0}^{m_t}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{t-1}T_j^{c_j}\}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{t+1}$ corresponding to $\bar{d}$. Finally assume that there exists $\bar{d}\in\mathcal{D}_i$ such that M is reducible with respect to the subset $\{T_i^{c_is_i}\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{c_j}\}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{i+1}$ corresponding to $\bar{d}$. Then we have

$$\alpha=\sum_{j=0}^{k}(n_j-a_j)\beta_j+\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(l_j-c_j)\gamma_j+(l_i-c_is_i)\gamma_i+|\bar{d}|,$$

where all the coefficients in the summations are nonnegative integers, $|\bar{d}|\in(S_k+U_{i-1})$ and $(l_i-c_is_i)<l_i$. Thus $\alpha\in((l_i-c_is_i)\gamma_i+S_k+U_{i-1})$, which contradicts the choice of l_i as the smallest nonnegative integer such that $\alpha\in(l_i\gamma_i+S_k+U_{i-1})$. This shows that M is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$.

To check that such representation is unique assume that $\alpha=\sum_{j=0}^{k}n'_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=1}^{i}l'_j\gamma_j$ is another representation satisfying the requirements of the proposition. If $l_i=l'_i$ then applying the inductive hypothesis to $\alpha-l_i\gamma_i$ we deduce that $n_j=n'_j$ and $l_j=l'_j$ for all j. Thus it suffices to show that $l_i=l'_i$.

Denote by K the set of indices j such that $n_j>n'_j$ and by K' the set of indices j such that $n'_j>n_j$, denote by I the set of indices j such that $l_j>l'_j$ and by I' the set of indices j such that $l'_j>l_j$. Then we can write

$$\sum_{j\in K}(n_j-n'_j)\beta_j+\sum_{j\in I}(l_j-l'_j)\gamma_j=\sum_{j\in K'}(n'_j-n_j)\beta_j+\sum_{j\in I'}(l'_j-l_j)\gamma_j, \tag{4.2}$$

where all the coefficients in the summations are positive integers. We will show that $i\notin(I\cup I')$ and therefore $l_i=l'_i$.

Assume that $i\in I$ then equation (4.2) implies that $(l_i-l'_i)\gamma_i\in(G_k+H_{i-1})$ and therefore $(l_i-l'_i)=rs_i$ for some positive integer r, and moreover,

$$\sum_{j\in K}(n_j-n'_j)\beta_j+\sum_{j\in I}(l_j-l'_j)\gamma_j\in(S_k+U_{i-1}).$$

So, there exists a $(k+i+1)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $\bar{d}=(a_0,\dots,a_k,c_1,\dots,c_i)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{d}\text{ is reduced with respect to }((S_k+U_{i-1}),s_i\gamma_i);\\ &a_j=0\text{ if }j\notin K,\ a_j\le(n_j-n'_j)\text{ if }j\in K;\\ &c_j=0\text{ if }j\notin I,\ c_j\le(l_j-l'_j)\text{ if }j\in I\text{ and }c_i\le r.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, we get that $\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{c_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Thus $\bar{d}\in\mathcal{D}_i$ and $T_i^{c_is_i}\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{c_j}\in\mathcal{T}_{i+1}$. This contradicts irreducibility of $\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{l_j}$. Thus $i\notin I$.

The same argument with n_j and l_j switched to n'_j and l'_j, respectively, shows that $i\notin I'$. □

The next statement is a straight forward consequence of Proposition 4.3.

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose that* $(a_0,\dots,a_k,c_1,\dots,c_i)\neq(b_0,\dots,b_k,d_1,\dots,d_i)$ *are distinct* $(k+1+i)$*-tuples of nonnegative integers. If* $f=\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j}$ *and* $g=\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{b_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{d_j}$ *are both irreducible with respect to* $\mathcal{T}$ *then* $\nu(f)\neq\nu(g)$.

The next corollary of Lemma 3.1 is a technical statement that will be used to describe redundant jumping polynomials.

Corollary 4.5. *Suppose that* $i,k,M\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *and the* $(M+1+i)$*-tuple of nonnegative integers* $(a_0,\dots,a_M,c_1,\dots,c_i)$ *is such that* $a_M>0$ *and* $\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j}$ *is irreducible with respect to* $\mathcal{T}$*. Set* $\alpha=\sum_{i=0}^{M}a_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=1}^{i}c_j\gamma_j$.

If $\alpha\in(G_k+H_i)$ *then* $M\leq\max(k,m_i)$.

Proof. We first observe that it is enough to prove the statement under the assumption $k\geq m_i$. Applying Lemma 3.1 to α we find $n_0\in\mathbb{Z}$ and a $(k+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n_1,\dots,n_k,l_1,\dots,l_i)$ such that $\alpha=\sum_{i=0}^{k}n_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=1}^{i}l_j\gamma_j$ and $n_j<q_j$, $l_j<s_j$ for all $j>0$.

Assume for contradiction that $M>k$ and apply Lemma 3.1 to $\sum_{i=0}^{k}a_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=1}^{i}c_j\gamma_j$ to find $n'_0\in\mathbb{Z}$ and a $(k+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $(n'_1,\dots,n'_k,l'_1,\dots,l'_i)$ such that $\alpha=\sum_{i=0}^{k}n'_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=k+1}^{M}a_j\beta_j+\sum_{j=1}^{i}l_j\gamma_j$ and $n'_j<q_j$, $l'_j<s_j$ for all $j>0$. Notice that since $\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ we also have $a_j<q_j$ for all $j>0$. Thus the $(M+i)$-tuples $(n_1,\dots,n_k,0,\dots,0,l_1,\dots,l_i)$ and $(n'_1,\dots,n'_k,a_{k+1},\dots,a_M,l'_1,\dots,l'_i)$ have to coincide. This contradicts the assumption $a_M>0$. So $M\leq k$.

□

We now recall the definition of a generating sequence of ν. Let $\Phi_R=\nu(R\backslash\{0\})$ be the semigroup consisting of the values of nonzero elements of R. For $\sigma\in\Phi_R$, let $I_\sigma=\{f\in R\mid\ \nu(f)\geq\sigma\}$. A (possibly infinite) sequence $\{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ of elements of R is a *generating sequence* of ν if for every $\sigma\in\Phi_R$ the ideal I_σ is generated by the set $\{\prod_{i=1}^{k}Q_i{}^{b_i}\mid k,\ b_i\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\ \nu(\prod_{i=1}^{k}Q_i{}^{b_i})\geq\sigma\}$. Notice that if $\sigma\in\Phi_R$ then there exist $k,b_1,\dots,b_k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\nu(\prod_{i=1}^{k}Q_i^{b_i})=\sigma$. In particular, the set of values $\{\nu(Q_i)\}_{i>0}$ generate Φ_R as a semigroup. A generating sequence $\{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ is minimal if no its proper subsequence is a generating sequence of ν.

For $\sigma\in\Phi_R$ denote by $\mathcal{A}_\sigma$ the ideal of R generated by the set $\{\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j}\mid i,k,a_j,c_j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\ \nu(\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j})\geq\sigma\}$ and by $\mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$ the ideal of R generated by $\{\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j}\mid i,k,a_j,c_j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\ \nu(\prod_{j=0}^{k}P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i}T_j^{c_j})>\sigma\}$.

We will show that $I_\sigma=\mathcal{A}_\sigma$ for all $\sigma\in\Phi_R$ to conclude that $\{P_j\}_{j\geq 0}\cup\{T_j\}_{j>0}$ is a generating sequence of ν. To this end we observe the following properties of $\mathcal{A}$-ideals

1) $\mathcal{A}_\sigma\subset I_\sigma$
2) if $\sigma_1<\sigma_2$ then $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_2}\subset\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_1}^+\subset\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_1}$

3) $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_1}\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_2} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}$ and $\mathcal{A}^+_{\sigma_1}\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_2} \subset \mathcal{A}^+_{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}$
4) if $\alpha = \min(\beta_0, \beta_1, \gamma_1)$ then $m_R \subset \mathcal{A}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{A}^+_0$
5) for any $\sigma \in \Phi_R$ there exists $\sigma' \in \Phi$ such that $\mathcal{A}^+_\sigma = \mathcal{A}_{\sigma'}$ (we take $\sigma' = \min\{\alpha \in \Phi_R | \ \sigma < \alpha \leq \sigma + \beta_0\}$, where σ' is well defined since the set on the right is a nonempty finite set.)

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that* $k, i \geq 0$, $f \in R \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $f = \prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{c_j}$ *for some* $a_j, c_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. *For* $\alpha = \nu(\prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{c_j})$ *let the* $(m+1+i)$*-tuple of nonnegative integers* $(n_0, \ldots, n_m, l_1, \ldots, l_i)$ *be as described by Proposition 4.3.*

Then there exist $\theta \in k \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $f' \in \mathcal{A}^+_\alpha$ *such that* $f = \theta \prod_{j=0}^m P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{l_j} + f'$.

Proof. As above it suffices to consider the case when $i \geq 0$ and $k \geq m_i$. We set $c_0 = 0$ and use induction on (i, c_i, k). If $i = 0$ and $k = m_0 = 0$ then the statement holds with $\theta = 1$, $n_0 = a_0$ and $f' = 0$.

Assume that i is fixed and $k > m_i$. Let $n_k, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be such that $a_k = bq_k + n_k$ and $n_k < q_k$. Then

$$P_k^{a_k} = P_k^{n_k}(\lambda_k \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{n_{k,j}} + P_{k+1})^b = (\lambda_k^b \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{bn_{k,j}})P_k^{n_k} + h$$

where $h \in \mathcal{A}^+_{a_k\beta_k}$. Let $g = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{a_j+bn_{k,j}} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{c_j}$ and $h' = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{c_j} h$. Notice that $h' \in \mathcal{A}^+_\alpha$. Since $k - 1 \geq m_i$ the inductive hypothesis applied to g gives

$$f = \lambda_k^b g P_k^{n_k} + h' = \lambda_k^b(\theta' \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{l_j} + g')P_k^{n_k} + h',$$

where $\theta' \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $g' \in \mathcal{A}^+_{\alpha - n_k\beta_k}$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Then by the argument from the proof of Lemma 4.3 we also have $\prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{n_j} \prod_{j=1}^i T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and therefore, the statement holds with $\theta = \lambda_k^b\theta'$ and $f' = \lambda_k^b g' P_k^{n_k} + h'$.

Assume now that $i > 0$ and $k = m_i$. Let $g = \prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_j}$. Then by the inductive hypothesis applied to g

$$f = gT_i^{c_i} = (\theta' \prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{n'_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l'_j})T_i^{c_i} + g'T_i^{c_i},$$

where $\theta' \in k \setminus \{0\}$ and $g' \in \mathcal{A}^+_{\alpha - c_i\gamma_i}$. If $\prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{n'_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l'_j} T_i^{c_i}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ then the statement holds with $\theta = \theta'$, $f' = g'T_i^{c_i}$ and $(n_0, \ldots, n_m, l_1, \ldots, l_i) = (n'_0, \ldots, n'_k, l'_1, \ldots, l'_{i-1}, c_i)$. If $\prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{n'_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l'_j} T_i^{c_i}$ is not irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ then there exists a $(k+1+i)$-tuple of nonnegative integers $\bar{d} = (a'_0, \ldots, a'_k, c'_1, \ldots, c'_i)$ such that $a'_j \leq n'_j$, $c'_j \leq l'_j$ for all j, $0 < c'_i s_i \leq c_i$ and $(T_i^{c'_i s_i} \prod_{j=0}^k P_j^{a'_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c'_j}) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Then from definition of $T_{\bar{d}}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \theta'(\mu_{\bar{d}}\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}} + T_{\bar{d}})(\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n'_j-a'_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l'_j-c'_j})T_i^{c_i-c'_is_i} + g'T_i^{c_i} \\ &= \mu_{\bar{d}}\theta'(\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}+n'_j-a'_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}+l'_j-c'_j})T_i^{c_i-c'_is_i} + h + g'T_i^{c_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha^+$. Let $g_1 = (\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_{\bar{d},j}+n'_j-a'_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}+l'_j-c'_j})T_i^{c_i-c'_is_i}$. Since $c_i - c'_is_i < c_i$ by the inductive hypothesis applied to g_1

$$f = \mu_{\bar{d}}\theta' g_1 + h + g'T_i^{c_i} = \mu_{\bar{d}}\theta'(\theta''\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j} + g'_1) + h + g'T_i^{c_i},$$

where $\theta'' \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $g'_1 \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha^+$ and $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and therefore, the statement holds with $\theta = \mu_{\bar{d}}\theta'\theta''$ and $f' = \mu_{\bar{d}}\theta' g'_1 + h + g'T_i^{c_i}$. □

Lemma 4.7. *If $\gamma \in \Phi_R$, then $I_\gamma = \mathcal{A}_\gamma$.*

Proof. We only need to check that $I_\gamma \subset \mathcal{A}_\gamma$ for all $\gamma \in \Phi_R$.

Let $\gamma \in \Phi_R$ and let $f \in I_\gamma$. We will show that $f \in \mathcal{A}_\gamma$. First notice that if $f \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Phi_R$ then $\alpha \le \nu(f)$. Thus the set $\Omega = \{\alpha \in \Phi_R | \, f \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha\}$ is finite since it is bounded from above and it is nonempty since $f \in \mathcal{A}_0$. We choose σ to be the maximal element of Ω. Then there exists a presentation

$$f = \sum_{e=1}^{N} g_e \prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_{e,j}} + f',$$

where $g_e \in R$, $\sum_{j=0}^{k} a_{e,j}\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} c_{e,j}\gamma_j = \sigma$ for all e and $f' \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$.

We now apply Lemma 4.6 to $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_{e,j}}$ for all $1 \le e \le N$. We get $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_{e,j}} = \theta_e \prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j} + h_e$, where $\theta_e \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $h_e \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{m} n_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i} l_j\gamma_i = \sigma$. Thus

$$f = (\sum_{e=1}^{N}\theta_e g_e)\prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j} + \sum_{e=1}^{N} h_e g_e + f' = g\prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j} + h,$$

where $g = (\sum_{e=1}^{N}\theta_e g_e)$ and $h \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$. If $g \in m_R$ then $g\prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j} \in \mathcal{A}_0^+\mathcal{A}_\sigma \subset \mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$ and therefore $f \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma^+$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi_R$ be such that $\mathcal{A}_\sigma^+ = \mathcal{A}_\alpha$. Then $\alpha > \sigma$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$, a contradiction to the choice of σ. So g is a unit in R and $\nu(g) = 0$. Since $\nu(g\prod_{j=0}^{m} P_j^{n_j}\prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{l_j}) = \sigma$ and $\nu(h) > \sigma$ we get that $\nu(f) = \sigma$. Thus $\sigma \ge \gamma$, and so $f \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma \subset \mathcal{A}_\gamma$. □

Theorem 4.8. *$\{P_i\}_{i\ge0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ is a generating sequence of ν, $\Phi_R = S + U$ and $\{\beta_i\}_{i\ge0} \cup \{\gamma_i\}_{i>0}$ generate Φ_R as a semigroup.*

Proof. The statement follows at once from the definition of generating sequences and Lemma 4.7. □

It is desirable to determine a minimal set of generators for Φ_R and to extract a minimal generating sequence for ν if possible. In general $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}\cup\{\gamma_i\}_{i>0}$ will not be a minimal set of generators for Φ_R. One way to reduce this set is to remove dependent values: if $i>0$ we say that β_i is dependent if $\beta_i\in S_{i-1}$, we say that γ_i is dependent if $\gamma_i\in(S_{m_i}+U_{i-1})$. For $i\geq 0$ we say that β_i (or γ_{i+1}) is independent if β_i (or γ_{i+1}) is not dependent. Then the set of all independent values is a generating set for Φ_R. It is not minimal in general, see example 8.2. On the level of polynomials removing redundant jumping polynomials will lead to a subsequence of $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0}\cup\{T_i\}_{i>0}$ that is still a generating sequence of ν.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that $i>0$ and $T_i\neq 0$ is a redundant jumping polynomial. Denote by K the number of nonzero successors of T_i. Then there exist $M,N\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that*

$$T_i=\sum_{e=0}^{K}\theta_e\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N}T_j^{c_{e,j}},$$

where $\theta_e\in k\setminus\{0\}$, $a_{e,j},c_{e,j}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all e,j and $\prod_{i=0}^{M}P_j^{a_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N}T_j^{c_{e,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ for all e. Moreover, $\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_{0,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N}T_j^{c_{0,j}})=\nu(T_i)$ and $\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_{e-1,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N}T_j^{c_{e-1,j}})<\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M}P_j^{a_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N}T_j^{c_{e,j}})$ for all $e\geq 1$.

Proof. We use induction on K. Since $T_i\neq 0$ and T_i is redundant, by definition of the only immediate successor $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j}$ of T_i we have

$$T_i=\mu_{\bar d}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i}P_j^{n_{\bar d,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{l_{\bar d,j}}+T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j},$$

where $\mu_{\bar d}\in k\setminus\{0\}$, $\prod_{j=0}^{m_i}P_j^{n_{\bar d,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{l_{\bar d,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ and $\nu(T_i)=\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{m_i}P_j^{n_{\bar d,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{l_{\bar d,j}})$ while $\nu(T_i)<\nu(T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j})$.

If $K=0$ then $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j}=0$ and the above representation satisfies the statement of the lemma. If $K>0$ then $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j}$ is a redundant jumping polynomial with $K-1$ nonzero successors. So by the inductive hypothesis

$$T_i=\mu_{\bar d}\prod_{j=0}^{m_i}P_j^{n_{\bar d,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-1}T_j^{l_{\bar d,j}}+\sum_{e=0}^{K-1}\theta'_e\prod_{j=0}^{M'}P_j^{a'_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N'}T_j^{c'_{e,j}},$$

where $\theta'_e\in k\setminus\{0\}$, $a'_{e,j},c'_{e,j}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all e,j, $\prod_{i=0}^{M'}P_j^{a'_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N'}T_j^{c'_{e,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ for all e and $\nu(T_i)<\nu(T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_j})\leq\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M'}P_j^{a'_{e-1,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N'}T_j^{c'_{e-1,j}})<\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M'}P_j^{a'_{e,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{N'}T_j^{c'_{e,j}})$ for all $e\geq 1$. Thus after appropriately renaming the indices, exponents and coefficients we obtain the required representation. □

We now refine the notion of $\mathcal{A}$-ideals by using only jumping polynomials that are not redundant. Set $\mathcal{R} = \{j \mid T_j \text{ is redundant}\}$. For $\sigma \in \Phi_R$ denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\sigma$ the ideal of R generated by the set

$$\{\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_j} \mid i,k,a_j,c_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0};\ \nu(\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_j}) \geq \sigma;\ c_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Corollary 4.10. *If $\sigma \in \Phi_R$ then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\sigma = \mathcal{A}_\sigma$.*

Proof. By construction $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\sigma \subset \mathcal{A}_\sigma$. To show that $\mathcal{A}_\sigma \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\sigma$ we will check that any generator $\prod_{j=0}^{k} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} T_j^{c_j}$ of $\mathcal{A}_\sigma$ belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\sigma$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\sigma_1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\sigma_2} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}$ for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \in \Phi_R$ it is suffices to check that $P_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\beta_i}$ and $T_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\gamma_i}$ for all i. By construction we have $P_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\beta_i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $T_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\gamma_i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \setminus \mathcal{R}$.

Assume that $i \in \mathcal{R}$ and use Lemma 4.9 to write

$$T_i = \sum_{e=0}^{K} \theta_e \prod_{j=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{N} T_j^{c_{e,j}}.$$

For all $e \geq 0$, since $\prod_{j=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{N} T_j^{c_{e,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ we have $c_{e,j} = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{R}$. Also for all $e \geq 0$, we have $\nu(\prod_{j=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{N} T_j^{c_{e,j}}) \geq \gamma_i$. Thus $T_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\gamma_i}$. □

The next statement follows immediately from Lemma 4.7, Corollary 4.10 and definition of generating sequences.

Proposition 4.11. *$\{P_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \cup \{T_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \setminus \mathcal{R}}$ is a generating sequence of ν.*

We now provide a sufficient condition for a jumping polynomial to be redundant. It will allow us to recognize redundant jumping polynomials in Example 8.2.

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose that $i, K, M > 0$ and $T_i = \sum_{e=1}^{K} \theta_e \prod_{j=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e,j}} \neq 0$, with $\theta_e \in k$, $a_{e,j}, c_{e,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all e, j and $\prod_{j=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e,j}}$ irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ for all e. Then T_i is redundant.*

Proof. After possibly collecting like terms we may assume that in the presentation

$$T_i = \sum_{e=1}^{K} \theta_e \prod_{i=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e,j}}$$

$(a_{e_1,0}, \ldots, a_{e_1,M}, c_{e_1,1}, \ldots, c_{e_1,i-1}) \neq (a_{e_2,0}, \ldots, a_{e_2,M}, c_{e_2,1}, \ldots, c_{e_2,i-1})$ for all $e_1 \neq e_2$and $\theta_e \neq 0$ for all e. Then by Corollary 4.4, after possibly rearranging terms, we may further assume that $\nu(\prod_{i=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e-1,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e-1,j}}) < \nu(\prod_{i=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e,j}})$ for all $e > 1$ and $\nu(\prod_{i=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{1,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{1,j}}) = \gamma_i$. In particular, $\gamma_i \in (S_M + U_{i-1}) \subset (G + H_{i-1})$.

By construction of jumping polynomials we have $s_i = 1$ and $\gamma_i \in (G_{m_i} + H_{i-1})$. Denote by $M_1 = \max\{j \mid a_{1,j} > 0\}$ and apply Corollary 4.5 to $\gamma_i = \sum_{j=0}^{M_1} a_{1,j}\beta_j +$

$\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_{1,j}\gamma_j$ to get $M_1 \leq m_i$. Thus $\gamma_i \in (S_{m_i} + U_{i-1})$. Also, the only immediate successor of T_i is $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_i} = T_i - \theta_1 \prod_{i=0}^{m_i} P_j^{a_{1,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{1,j}}$.

We now use induction on K. If $K = 1$ then $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_i} = 0$ and, therefore, T_i is redundant. If $K > 1$ then $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_i} = \sum_{e=2}^{K} \theta_e \prod_{i=0}^{M} P_j^{a_{e,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{c_{e,j}}$. By the inductive hypothesis $T_{\sum_{j=0}^{i}\delta_i}$ is redundant and, therefore, T_i is redundant. □

5. Defining sequences

In this section we describe numerical data that uniquely determines a valuation on $k(x,y,z)$ centered at $k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)}$.

Given sequences of positive rational numbers $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ and $\{\bar\gamma_i\}_{i>0}$ we use notation as in section 3. Let $\bar m_0 = 0$, $G'_0 = \beta'_0\mathbb{Z}$, $\bar H_0 = \{0\}$ and for all $i > 0$ set

$$S'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad G'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad S' = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} S'_j, \quad G' = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} G'_j$$

$$\bar U_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \bar\gamma_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad \bar H_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \bar\gamma_j \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar U = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bar U_j, \quad \bar H = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bar H_j$$

$$q'_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid q\beta'_i \in G'_{i-1}\}, \qquad \bar s_i = \min\{s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid s\bar\gamma_i \in (\bar H_{i-1} + G')\}$$
$$\text{and} \quad \bar m_i = \max(\bar m_{i-1}, \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \bar s_i\bar\gamma_i \in (\bar H_{i-1} + G'_j)\}).$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 to $\alpha = q'_i\beta'_i$, an element of G'_{i-1} we find $n'_{i,0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and nonnegative integers $n'_{i,1}, \ldots, n'_{i,i-1}$ such that $n'_{i,j} < q'_j$ for all $j > 0$ and $\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} n'_{i,j}\beta'_j$. Applying Lemma 3.1 to $\alpha = \bar s_i\bar\gamma_i$, an element of $G'_{\bar m_i} + \bar H_{i-1}$, we find $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and nonnegative integers $\bar n_{i,1}, \ldots, \bar n_{i,\bar m_i}, \bar l_{i,1}, \ldots, \bar l_{i,i-1}$ such that $\bar n_{i,j} < q'_j$ and $\bar l_{i,j} < \bar s_j$ for all $j > 0$ and $\alpha = a_i\beta'_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\bar m_i} \bar n_{i,j}\beta'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar l_{i,j}\bar\gamma_j$. We set $\bar n_{i,0} = \max(0, a_i)$ and $\bar r_{i,0} = \max(0, -a_i)$.

The conditions we require sequences $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ and $\{\bar\gamma_i\}_{i>0}$ to satisfy are

$$\beta'_{i+1} > q'_i\beta'_i,$$

$$\bar\gamma_{i+1} > \bar r_{i,0}\beta'_0 + \bar s_i\bar\gamma_i.$$

Then by Corollary 3.3 we have $n'_{i,0} > 0$ for all $i > 0$.

Given sequences of residues $\{\lambda'_i\}_{i>0} \subset k \setminus \{0\}$ and $\{\bar{\mu}_i\}_{i>0} \subset k \setminus \{0\}$ we inductively define the sequences of polynomials $\{P'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ and $\{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ by setting

$$P'_0 = x, \quad P'_1 = y, \quad Q_1 = z,$$

$$P'_{i+1} = (P'_i)^{q'_i} - \lambda'_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (P'_j)^{n'_{i,j}},$$

$$Q_{i+1} = x^{\bar{r}_{i,0}} Q_i^{\bar{s}_i} - \bar{\mu}_i \prod_{j=0}^{\bar{m}_i} (P'_j)^{\bar{n}_{i,j}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} Q_j^{\bar{l}_{i,j}}.$$

Our main statement to be proved in section 6 is

Theorem 5.1. *In the above notation assuming that infinitely many q'_i and $\bar{s}_i$ are greater than 1 there exists a unique valuation $\nu : k(x, y, z) \to \mathbb{Q}$ such that ν dominates $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ and $\nu(P'_i) = \beta'_i$ and $\nu(Q_i) = \bar{\gamma}_i$ for all i.*

If ν is a valuation on $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ as provided by Theorem 5.1 we claim that the sequence of jumping polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ for ν as defined in section 2 satisfies $P_i = P'_i$ for all $i \geq 0$. Indeed, we have $P_0 = x = P'_0$ and $P_1 = y = P'_1$. Fix $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and assume that $P_j = P'_j$ for all $j \leq i$. Then $\beta_j = \beta'_j$, $G_j = G'_j$ and $q_j = q'_j$ for all $j \leq i$. Due to uniqueness of $n_{i,0}, \dots, n_{i,i-1}$ such that $q'_i\beta'_i = q_i\beta_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} n_{i,j}\beta_{i,j}$ and $n_{i,j} < q_j$ for all $j > 0$ we also have $n_{i,j} = n'_{i,j}$ for all $j < i$. Then $P_i^{q_i} / \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}} = (P'_i)^{q'_i} / \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (P'_j)^{n'_{i,j}}$ and therefore, $\lambda_i = \lambda'_i$. Thus

$$P_{i+1} = P_i^{q_i} - \lambda_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} P_j^{n_{i,j}} = (P'_i)^{q'_i} - \lambda'_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (P'_j)^{n'_{i,j}} = P'_{i+1}.$$

We will now drop apostrophes in the notation for defining polynomials.

6. Properties of defining polynomials

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 5.1. We use the simplified notation of section 5. In particular, if $i \geq 0$ then P_i denotes a defining polynomial. Also, we use lexicographical order to compare k-tuples of integers: we say $(a_1, \dots, a_k) < (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ if and only if there exists $l < k$ such that $a_i = b_i$ for all $i \leq l$ and $a_{l+1} < b_{l+1}$.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that $A = k[x]$ and $i \geq 1$ then P_i is a monic polynomial in $A[y]$ and $\deg_y P_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j$. Moreover, if $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{i-1}$ are nonnegative integers such that $a_j < q_j$ for all $j < i$ then $\deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} P_j^{a_j}) < \deg_y P_i$.*

Proof. Same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 proves this statement. □

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose that the* m*-tuples of nonnegative integers* $(a_1,\dots,a_m)$ *and* $(b_1,\dots,b_m)$ *are such that* $a_j, b_j < q_j$ *for all* $j < m$*. If* $(a_m,\dots,a_1) < (b_m,\dots,b_1)$ *then* $\deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{a_j}) < \deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{b_j})$*.*

In particular, if $f = \sum_{a_m=0}^{q}\left(\sum_{0\le a_j<q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_m}(x)\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} P_j^{a_j}\right) P_m^{a_m}$*, where* $f_{a_1,\dots,a_m} \in k[x]$ *for all* $(a_1,\dots,a_m)$*, then* $\deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{a_j}) \le \deg_y f$*.*

Proof. Let $(a_m,\dots,a_1) < (b_m,\dots,b_1)$ then there exists $1 \le l \le m$ such that $a_l < b_l$ and $a_j = b_j$ for all $j > l$. Then

$$\deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{a_j}) < \deg_y(P_l^{a_l+1}\prod_{j=l+1}^m P_j^{a_j}) \le \deg_y(\prod_{j=l}^m P_j^{b_j}) \le \deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{b_j}).$$

Consider now $f = \sum_{a_m=0}^{q}\left(\sum_{0\le a_j<q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_m}(x)\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} P_j^{a_j}\right) P_m^{a_m}$. Set

$$(b_m,\dots,b_1) = \max\{(a_m,\dots,a_1) \mid f_{a_1,\dots,a_m} \ne 0\}$$

Then $\deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{a_j}) < \deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{b_j})$ for all $(a_1,\dots,a_m) \ne (b_1,\dots,b_m)$. Thus $\deg_y f = \deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{b_j}) \ge \deg_y(\prod_{j=1}^m P_j^{a_j})$. Notice also that $\operatorname{lead}_y f = f_{b_1,\dots,b_m}$. □

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that* $A = k[x,y]$ *and* $i \ge 1$ *then* Q_i *is a polynomial in* $A[z]$ *with* $\deg_z Q_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\bar s_j$ *and* $\operatorname{lead}_z Q_i = x^{d_i}$*, where* $d_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1}(\bar r_{k,0}\prod_{j=k+1}^{i-1}\bar s_j)$*.*

Moreover, if $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{i-1}$ *are nonnegative integers such that* $a_j < \bar s_j$ *for all* $j < i$ *then* $\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} Q_j^{a_j}) < \deg_z Q_i$*.*

Proof. We use induction on i. For $i = 1$ we have $Q_1 = z$ is monic of degree 1. Let $i > 1$ then $Q_i = x^{\bar r_{i-1,0}} Q_{i-1}^{\bar s_{i-1}} - \bar\mu_{i-1}\prod_{j=0}^{\bar m_{i-1}} P_j^{\bar n_{i-1,j}}\prod_{j=1}^{i-2} Q_j^{\bar l_{i-1,j}}$. By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg_z Q_{i-1}^{\bar s_{i-1}} &= \prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\bar s_j,\\
\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{i-2} Q_j^{\bar l_{i-1,j}}) &= \bar l_{i-1,1} + \bar l_{i-1,2}\bar s_1 + \cdots + \bar l_{i-1,i-2}\bar s_1\cdots\bar s_{i-3}\\
&< \bar s_1 + (\bar s_2 - 1)\bar s_1 + \cdots + (\bar s_{i-2} - 1)\bar s_1\cdots\bar s_{i-3} = \bar s_1\cdots\bar s_{i-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\deg_z Q_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1}\bar s_j$ and $\operatorname{lead}_z P_i = x^{\bar r_{i-1,0}}(\operatorname{lead}_z Q_{i-1})^{\bar s_{i-1}} = x^{d_i}$, where $d_i = \bar r_{i-1,0} + \bar s_{i-1}\sum_{k=1}^{i-2}(\bar r_{k,0}\prod_{j=k+1}^{i-2}\bar s_j) = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1}(\bar r_{k,0}\prod_{j=k+1}^{i-1}\bar s_j)$. □

The next statement is a straight forward consequence of Proposition 6.3.

Corollary 6.4. *Suppose that* $A = k[x, x^{-1}, y]$ *and* $i \ge 1$ *then* $x^{-d_i}Q_i$ *is a monic polynomial in* $A[z]$ *and* $\deg_z(x^{-d_i}Q_i) = \bar s_1\cdots\bar s_{i-1}$*.*

Using the argument of the proof of Corollary 6.2 we also get the following statement:

Corollary 6.5. *Suppose that the n-tuples of nonnegative integers $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $(b_1,\dots,b_n)$ are such that $a_j, b_j < \bar{s}_j$ for all $j < n$. If $(a_n,\dots,a_1) < (b_n,\dots,b_1)$ then $\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^n Q_j^{a_j}) < \deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^n Q_j^{b_j})$.*

In particular, if $f = \sum_{a_n=0}^{s}\left(\sum_{0\le a_j<\bar{s}_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_n}(x,y)\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} Q_j^{a_j}\right) Q_n^{a_n}$, where $f_{a_1,\dots,a_n} \in k[x,y]$ for all $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, then $\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^n Q_j^{a_j}) \le \deg_z f$.

Remark 6.6. We expect the sequence of polynomial $\{P_i\}_{i>0}$ to satisfy MacLane's axioms for key polynomials corresponding to the field extension $k(x) \hookrightarrow k(x,y)$ and $\{x^{-d_i}Q_i\}_{i>0}$ to satisfy the axioms for key polynomials corresponding to the field extension $k(x,y) \hookrightarrow k(x,y,z)$.

Lemma 6.7. *Suppose that $f \in k[x,y]$ and M is such that $\deg_y f < \deg_y P_{M+1}$ then there exists a unique representation*

$$f = \sum_{0\le a_j<q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_M}(x)\prod_{j=1}^{M} P_j^{a_j}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $f_{a_1,\dots,a_M} \in k[x]$ for all $(a_1,\dots,a_M)$.

Proof. We use induction on M. If $M = 0$ then $\deg_y f < 1$. Thus $f \in k[x]$ and $f = f(x)$ is the required representation.

Assume $M > 0$ and set $A = k[x]$. If $f \ne 0$ since P_M is a monic polynomial in $A[y]$ by Euclidean division in $A[y]$ we find $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ such that

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{q} g_i P_M^i, \tag{6.2}$$

where $g_i \in A[y]$, $g_q \ne 0$ and $\deg_y g_i < \deg_y P_M$ for all i. Since $\deg_y f = \deg_y(g_q P_M^q)$ and $\deg_y f < \deg_y P_{M+1}$ applying Proposition 6.1 we get $q\prod_{j=1}^{M-1} q_j < \prod_{j=1}^{M} q_j$ and therefore $q < q_M$. Thus there exists a representation

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{q} g_i P_M^i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{q_M-1} 0\cdot P_M^i = \sum_{0\le a_M<q_M} h_{a_M} P_M^{a_M} \tag{6.3}$$

such that $h_{a_M} \in A[y]$ and $\deg_y h_{a_M} < \deg P_M$ for all a_M. Also h_{a_M} are uniquely determined for all a_M due to uniqueness of representation (6.2).

Applying the inductive hypothesis to h_{a_M} for all a_M we get

$$f = \sum_{0\le a_M<q_M}\left(\sum_{0\le a_j<q_j} h_{(a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}),a_M}(x)\prod_{j=1}^{M-1} P_j^{a_j}\right) P_M^{a_M} = \sum_{0\le a_j<q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_M}(x)\prod_{j=1}^{M} P_j^{a_j}.$$

By the inductive hypothesis $f_{a_1,\dots,a_M}(x)$ are uniquely determined for all $(a_1,\dots,a_M)$. □

In general, if $f \in k[x,y] \setminus \{0\}$ and M is any positive integer following the proof of Lemma 6.7 we obtain a unique representation

$$f = \sum_{a_M=0}^{q'} \left(\sum_{0 \leq a_j < q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_M}(x) \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} P_j^{a_j} \right) P_M^{a_M},$$

where q' is a nonnegative integer not necessarily less than q_M, $f_{a_1,\dots,a_M} \in k[x]$ for all $(a_1,\dots,a_M)$ and $f_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1},q'} \neq 0$ for some $(a_1,\dots,a_{M-1})$. For compatibility with representation (6.1) we set $q = \max(q', q_M - 1)$ and $f_{a_1,\dots,a_M} = 0$ for all $(a_1,\dots,a_M)$ such that $q' < a_M \leq q$. The representation

$$f = \sum_{a_M=0}^{q} \left(\sum_{0 \leq a_j < q_j} f_{a_1,\dots,a_M}(x) \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} P_j^{a_j} \right) P_M^{a_M},$$

is called a P_M-expansion of f. Notice that if M is such that $\deg_y P_{M+1} > \deg_y f$ then the P_M-expansion of f coincides with representation (6.1).

Lemma 6.8. *Suppose that* $f \in k[x,x^{-1},y,z]$ *and* N *is such that* $\deg_z f < \deg_z Q_{N+1}$ *then there exists a unique representation*

$$f = \sum_{0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j} f'_{c_1,\dots,c_N}(x,x^{-1},y) \prod_{j=1}^{N} (x^{-d_j} Q_j)^{c_j} \tag{6.4}$$

where $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \in k[x,x^{-1},y]$ *for all* $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$.

Proof. Notice that if $A = k[x,x^{-1},y]$ and $i > 0$ then by Corollary 6.4 $x^{-d_i}Q_i$ is a monic polynomial in $A[z]$. Now the argument of the proof of Lemma 6.7 applies. □

Corollary 6.9. *Suppose that* $f \in k[x,y,z]$ *and* N *is such that* $\deg_z f < \deg_z Q_{N+1}$ *then there exists a unique* $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *and representation*

$$x^K f = \sum_{0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j} f_{c_1,\dots,c_N}(x,y) \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}, \tag{6.5}$$

where $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \in k[x,y]$ *for all* $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ *and if* $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \in xk[x,y]$ *for all* $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ *then* $K = 0$.

Proof. We get the required representation by multiplying both sides of representation (6.4) by an appropriate power of x. More precisely,

$$K = \max\left(\max_{(c_1,\dots,c_N)} \left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_j c_j - \operatorname{ord}_x f'_{c_1,\dots,c_N}\right\}, 0\right).$$

□

In general, if $f \in k[x,y,z] \setminus \{0\}$ and N is any positive integer we can find a unique $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and representation

$$x^K f = \sum_{c_N=0}^{s'} \left(\sum_{0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j} f_{c_1,\dots,c_N}(x,y) \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j} \right) Q_N^{c_N},$$

such that s' is a nonnegative integer not necessarily less than $\bar{s}_N$, $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \in k[x,y]$ for all $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ and $f_{c_1,\dots,c_{N-1},s'} \neq 0$ for some $(c_1,\dots,c_{N-1})$, and if $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \in xk[x,y]$ for all $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ then $K=0$. For compatibility with representation (6.5) we set $s = \max(s', \bar{s}_N - 1)$ and $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} = 0$ for all $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ such that $s' < c_N \leq s$. The representation

$$x^K f = \sum_{c_N=0}^{s} \left(\sum_{0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j} f_{c_1,\dots,c_N}(x,y) \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j} \right) Q_N^{c_N}$$

is called a Q_N-expansion of f. Notice that if N is such that $\deg_z Q_{N+1} > \deg_z f$ then the Q_N-expansion of f coincides with representation (6.5).

Theorem 6.10. *Suppose that in notation of section 5 infinitely many q_i and $\bar{s}_i$ are greater than 1. Then for $f \in k[x,y,z] \setminus \{0\}$ there exist unique $K, M, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and representation*

$$x^K f = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq a_i < q_i \\ 0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}, \tag{6.6}$$

where $AC = (a_1,\dots,a_M,c_1,\dots,c_N)$, that satisfies the following conditions

$f_{AC} \in k[x]$ for all AC,
$f_{AC} \neq 0$ for some AC with $c_N > 0$,
$f_{AC} \neq 0$ for some AC with $a_M > 0$,
if $f_{AC} \in xk[x]$ for all AC then $K = 0$.

Proof. To construct representation (6.6) we will first apply Corollary 6.9 to f and then apply Lemma 6.7 to every term $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N}$ of representation (6.5).

First notice that since there are infinitely many $\bar{s}_i$ greater than 1, for any fixed degree d there is i such that $\deg_z Q_i > d$. If $f \in k[x,y]$ set $N = 0$. If $f \notin k[x,y]$ let N be such that $\deg_z Q_N \leq \deg_z f$ and $\deg_z f < \deg_z Q_{N+1}$. Then consider representation (6.5) of f

$$x^K f = \sum_{0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j} f_{c_1,\dots,c_N}(x,y) \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}.$$

If $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} = 0$ for all $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ such that $c_N > 0$, then $\deg_z f$ is bounded by $\deg_z \left(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{\bar{s}_j - 1} \right)$. Then $\deg_z f < \deg_z Q_N$, which contradicts the choice of N. Thus, there exists $(c_1,\dots,c_N)$ such that $c_N > 0$ and $f_{c_1,\dots,c_N} \neq 0$.

Now since there are infinitely many q_i greater than 1, for any fixed degree d there exists i such that $\deg_y P_i > d$. Set

$$d = \max_{(c_1,\ldots,c_N)} \deg_y f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N}$$

and let M be such that $\deg_y P_M \leq d$ and $d < \deg_y P_{M+1}$. Then consider representation (6.1) of $f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N}$ for all $C = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$

$$f_C = f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} = \sum_{0\leq a_i<q_i} f_{a_1,\ldots,a_M,c_1,\ldots,c_N}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} = \sum_{0\leq a_i<q_i} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i}.$$

Observe that if $C = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ is such that $c_N > 0$ and $f_C \neq 0$ then there exists $A = (a_1, \ldots, a_M)$ such that $f_{AC} \neq 0$.

Let now $C_d = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ be such that $\deg_y f_{C_d} = d$. If $f_{AC_d} = 0$ for all $A = (a_1, \ldots, a_M)$ such that $a_M > 0$, then $\deg_y f_{C_d}$ is bounded by $\deg_y \left(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{q_i-1}\right)$. Then $d < \deg_y P_M$, which contradicts the choice of M. Thus, there exists $A = (a_1, \ldots, a_M)$ such that $f_{AC_d} \neq 0$ and $a_M > 0$.

Finally, if $f_{AC} \in xk[x]$ for all AC then $f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} \in xk[x, y]$ for all $(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ and it follows from properties of representation (6.5) that $K = 0$. Thus

$$x^K f = \sum_{\substack{0\leq a_i<q_i \\ 0\leq c_j<s_j}} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}$$

is a representation of f that satisfies all the conditions.

Assume that

$$x^{K'} f = \sum_{\substack{0\leq a_i<q_i \\ 0\leq c_j<\bar{s}_j}} f'_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M'} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N'} Q_j^{c_j}$$

is another representation of f satisfying the conditions of the theorem.

We notice that $\deg_z f \leq \deg_z \left(\prod_{j=1}^{N'} Q_j^{\bar{s}_j-1}\right) < \deg_z Q_{N'+1}$. On the other hand since there exists AC such that $c_{N'} > 0$ and $f'_{AC} \neq 0$ we have $\deg_z f \geq \deg_z Q_{N'}$. Thus $N' = N$. For all $C = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ set

$$f'_C = f'_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} = \sum_{0\leq a_i<q_i} f'_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M'} P_i^{a_i}.$$

We will now show that if $K' > 0$ there exists $C_0 = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ such that $f'_{C_0} \notin xk[x, y]$. Assume that $K' > 0$, then there exists AC such that $f'_{AC} \notin xk[x]$. Let $A_0 = (b_1, \ldots, b_{M'})$ be such that

$$(b_{M'}, \ldots, b_1) = \max_{f'_{AC}\notin xk[x]} (a_{M'}, \ldots, a_1),$$

and let $C_0 = (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ be such that $f'_{A_0C_0} \notin xk[x]$. Assume for contradiction that $f'_{C_0} \in xk[x, y]$. Since for all $A = (a_1, \ldots, a_{M'})$ such that $(a_{M'}, \ldots, a_1) > (b_{M'}, \ldots, b_1)$ we have $f'_{AC_0} \in xk[x]$, the following polynomial

$$h = \sum_{\substack{A=(a_1,\ldots,a_{M'}) \\ (a_{M'},\ldots,a_1)>(b_{M'},\ldots,b_1)}} f'_{AC_0}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M'} P_i^{a_i}$$

is an element of $xk[x, y]$. Thus $(f'_{C_0} - h) \in xk[x, y]$, and therefore, $\operatorname{lead}_y(f'_{C_0} - h) \in xk[x]$. This contradicts the choice of A_0C_0 since by the proof of Corollary 6.2 we have $\operatorname{lead}_y(f'_{C_0} - h) = f'_{A_0C_0}$.

Thus

$$x^{K'} f = \sum_{0 \le c_j < \bar{s}_j} f'_{c_1,\ldots,c_N}(x, y) \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}$$

is another representation of f in the form of (6.5). Due to uniqueness of such a representation $K' = K$ and $f'_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} = f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N}$ for all $(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$.

We notice that $\deg_y f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} \le \deg_y \left(\prod_{i=1}^{M'} P_i^{q_i-1}\right) < \deg_y P_{M'+1}$ for all $(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$. On the other hand if $AC = (a_1, \ldots, a_{M'}, c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ is such that $a_{M'} > 0$ and $f'_{AC} \neq 0$ we have $\deg_y f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} \ge \deg_y P_{M'}$. Thus $M' = M$. For all $(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ we have

$$f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N} = \sum_{0 \le a_i < q_i} f'_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i}$$

is another representation of $f_{c_1,\ldots,c_N}$ in the form of (6.1). Due to uniqueness of such a representation we get $f'_{AC} = f_{AC}$ for all AC. □

In general, if $f \in k[x, y, z] \setminus \{0\}$ and M, N are some positive integers we can find a unique $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ and representation

$$x^K f = \sum_{c_N=0}^{s'} \sum_{a_M=0}^{q'} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \le a_i < q_i \\ 0 \le c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j} \right) P_M^{a_M} Q_N^{c_N},$$

where $AC = (a_1, \ldots, a_M, c_1, \ldots, c_N)$, s', q' are nonnegative integers not necessarily satisfying $s' < \bar{s}_N$ and $q' < q_N$, and the following conditions hold

$f_{AC} \in k[x]$ for all AC,
$f_{AC} \neq 0$ for some AC with $c_N = s'$,
$f_{AC} \neq 0$ for some AC with $a_M = q'$,
if $f_{AC} \in xk[x]$ for all AC then $K = 0$.

For compatibility with representation (6.6) we set $s = \max(s', \bar{s}_N - 1)$, $q = \max(q', q_M - 1)$ and $f_{AC} = 0$ for all AC such that $s' < c_N \le s$ or $q' < a_M \le q$.

The representation

$$x^K f = \sum_{c_N=0}^{s}\sum_{a_M=0}^{q}\left(\sum_{\substack{0\le a_i<q_i\\ 0\le c_j<\bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M-1}P_i^{a_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N-1}Q_j^{c_j}\right)P_M^{a_M}Q_N^{c_N},$$

is called an (M,N)-expansion of f. Notice that if M and N are chosen as in Theorem 6.10 then the (M,N)-expansion of f coincides with representation (6.6). Moreover, if $M'\ge M$ and $N'\ge N$, where M and N are as in Theorem 6.10, then the nonzero terms of the (M',N')-expansion of f coincide with the nonzero terms of representation (6.6) for f.

We now define the following $\mathbb{Q}$-valued maps. The value function val is defined on the set of monomials in $\{P_i\}_{i\ge1}\cup\{Q_j\}_{j\ge1}$ with a coefficient in $k[x]$. Let M and N be nonnegative integers, $\prod_{i=1}^M P_i^{b_i}\prod_{j=1}^N Q_j^{t_j}$ be a monomial and $f(x)\in k[x]$ be a nonzero polynomial, we set $\mathrm{val}(f\prod_{i=1}^M P_i^{b_i}\prod_{j=1}^N Q_j^{t_j}) = (\mathrm{ord}\, f)\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^M b_j\beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^N t_j\bar{\gamma}_j$. The following functions are defined on $k[x,y,z]\setminus\{0\}$. Let $f(x,y,z)$ be a nonzero polynomial and M, N be positive integers. Consider the (M,N)-expansion of f

$$x^K f = \sum_{c_N=0}^{s}\sum_{a_M=0}^{q}\left(\sum_{\substack{0\le a_i<q_i\\ 0\le c_j<\bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M-1}P_i^{a_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N-1}Q_j^{c_j}\right)P_M^{a_M}Q_N^{c_N},$$

and set $\nu_{M,N}(f) = -K\beta_0 + \min\{\mathrm{val}(f_{AC}\prod_{i=1}^M P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^N Q_j^{c_j}) \mid f_{AC}\ne 0\}$. Also consider representation (6.6) of f

$$x^K f = \sum_{\substack{0\le a_i<q_i\\ 0\le c_j<\bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M}P_i^{a_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N}Q_j^{c_j},$$

and set $\nu(f) = -K\beta_0 + \min\{\mathrm{val}(f_{AC}\prod_{i=1}^M P_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^N Q_j^{c_j}) \mid f_{AC}\ne 0\}$. Notice that if M and N are chosen as in Theorem 6.10 then $\nu(f)=\nu_{M,N}(f)$. Moreover, if $M'\ge M$ and $N'\ge N$, where M and N are as in Theorem 6.10, then $\nu_{M',N'}(f)=\nu(f)$.

We observe basic properties of val, $\nu_{M,N}$ and ν:

1. If H_1,H_2 are monomials in $\{P_i\}_{i\ge1}\cup\{Q_j\}_{j\ge1}$ and $f_1(x),f_2(x)\in k[x]\setminus\{0\}$ then $\mathrm{val}((f_1H_1)(f_2H_2)) = \mathrm{val}(f_1H_1)+\mathrm{val}(f_2H_2)$.
2. If $M,N,L\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $f\in k[x,y,z]\setminus\{0\}$ then $\nu_{M,N}(x^Lf) = L\beta_0+\nu_{M,N}(f)$.
3. If $M,N\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $f,g\in k[x,y,z]\setminus\{0\}$ then $\nu_{M,N}(f+g)\ge\min(\nu_{M,N}(f),\nu_{M,N}(g))$.
4. If $f,g\in k[x,y,z]\setminus\{0\}$ then $\nu(f+g)\ge\min(\nu(f),\nu(g))$.

The next two lemmas will allow us to show that $\nu_{M,N}(fg)=\nu_{M,N}(f)+\nu_{M,N}(g)$.

Lemma 6.11. *Suppose that $M\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $g=g_0(x)\prod_{i=1}^M P_i^{b_i}$ then $\nu_{M,1}(g)=\mathrm{val}(g)$. Moreover, there exists a unique M-tuple $(a_1,\dots,a_M)$ in the P_M-expansion of g such that $\mathrm{val}(g_{a_1,\dots,a_M}\prod_{j=1}^M P_j^{a_j})=\nu_{M,1}(g)$. Also, for the M-tuple above $a_M=b_M$.*

Proof. In order to find $\nu_{M,1}(g)$ we construct the $(M,1)$-expansion of g, which in this case coincides with the P_M-expansion. We use induction on (M,D), where $D = \deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{b_i})$.

If $M = 1$ then $g = g_0(x)P_1^{b_1}$ is the P_M-expansion of g and the statement follows. Assume that $M > 1$. Let $g' = g_0(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{b_i}$. Then by the inductive hypothesis the P_{M-1}-expansion

$$g' = \sum_{a_{M-1}=0}^{q} \left(\sum_{0\le a_i<q_i} g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} \right) P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}}.$$

has only one term of value $\mathrm{val}(g')$ and all other terms are of greater value. Consider the following expansion

$$g = \sum_{a_{M-1}=0}^{q} \left(\sum_{0\le a_i<q_i} g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} \right) P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}} P_M^{b_M}.$$

Only one term of this expansion has value $\mathrm{val}(g') + b_M\beta_M = \mathrm{val}(g)$, all other terms have greater value. Thus proving the statement of the lemma for every term of this expansion will prove the statement for g.

We fix a nonzero term $\bar{g} = g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i} P_M^{b_M}$ in the expansion of g and show that the lemma holds for $\bar{g}$. If $a_{M-1} < q_{M-1}$ then the representation above is the P_M-expansion of $\bar{g}$ and the lemma holds for $\bar{g}$. Assume that $a_{M-1} \ge q_{M-1}$, then

$$\bar{g} = g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} (\lambda_{M-1} x^{n_{M-1,0}} \prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{n_{M-1,i}} + P_M) P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}} P_M^{b_M} = g_1 + g_2,$$

where $g_1 = (\lambda_{M-1}x^{n_{M-1,0}} g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x))\prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i+n_{M-1,i}} P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}} P_M^{b_M}$ and $g_2 = g'_{a_1,\dots,a_{M-1}}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}} P_M^{b_M+1}$.

Notice that $\mathrm{val}(g_1) = \mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$ and $\mathrm{val}(g_2) > \mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$. Also notice that by Corollary 6.2 we have $\deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i}) \le \deg_y g'$, that is $\deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i}) \le D$.

Since $\deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}}) < \deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i})$ by the inductive hypothesis applied to g_2 we get $\nu_{M,1}(g_2) = \mathrm{val}(g_2) > \mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$ and all terms in the P_M-expansion of g_2 have values greater than $\mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$. In order to apply the inductive hypothesis to g_1 we notice that

$$\deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i+n_{M-1,i}} P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}}) < \deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-2} P_i^{a_i} P_{M-1}^{a_{M-1}-q_{M-1}+1}) \le \deg_y(\prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i})$$

Thus $\nu_{M,1}(g_1) = \mathrm{val}(g_1) = \mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$ and only one term in the P_M-expansion of g_1 has value $\mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$. Moreover, the power of P_M in this term coincides with the power of P_M in g_1. This shows that the P_M-expansion of $\bar{g}$ will have a unique term of value $\mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$ and the power of P_M in this term will be b_M. All other terms in the P_M-expansion of $\bar{g}$ will have greater values, in particular, $\nu_{M,1}(\bar{g}) = \mathrm{val}(\bar{g})$. □

Lemma 6.12. *Suppose that $M, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ are such that $\bar{m}_{N-1} < M$.*
Suppose that $f = f_0(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{b_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{t_j}$ then $\nu_{M,N}(f) = \operatorname{val}(f)$. Moreover, there exists a unique $AC = (a_1, \dots, a_M, c_1 \dots, c_N)$ in the (M,N)-expansion of f such that $-K\beta_0 + \operatorname{val}(f_{AC}\prod_{j=1}^{M} P_j^{a_j} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}) = \nu_{M,N}(f)$. Also, for AC as above $a_M = b_M$ and $c_N = t_N$.

Proof. In order to find $\nu_{M,N}(f)$ we construct the (M,N)-expansion of f. We argue by induction on (N, D), where $D = \deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{t_j})$. The base case of $N = 1$ follows easily from Lemma 6.11. Assume that $N > 1$.

First notice that if the statement of the lemma holds for $x^L f$ for some $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ then it also holds for f. Let $f' = f_0(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{b_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{t_j}$ and

$$x^{K'} f' = \sum_{a_M=0}^{q} \sum_{c_{N-1}=0}^{s} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq a_i < q_i \\ 0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f'_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j} \right) P_M^{a_M} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}} \tag{6.7}$$

be the $(M, N-1)$-expansion of f'. Then after possibly multiplying f by some power of x we may assume that $K' = 0$ and $f'_{AC} \in x^{\bar{r}_{N-1,0}} k[x]$ for all terms of (6.7).

By the inductive hypothesis expansion (6.7) has only one term of value $\operatorname{val}(f')$ and all other terms are of greater value. Moreover, the power of P_M in this unique term of minimal value is b_M. Consider the following expansion

$$f = \sum_{a_M=0}^{q} \sum_{c_{N-1}=0}^{s} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq a_i < q_i \\ 0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f'_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j} \right) P_M^{a_M} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}} Q_N^{t_N} .$$

Only one term of this expansion has value $\operatorname{val}(f') + t_N \gamma_N = \operatorname{val}(f)$ and the power of P_M in this term is b_M, all other terms have greater value and the power of Q_N is t_N for all terms. Notice that the (M,N)-expansion of f can be obtained by adding the (M,N)-expansions of all terms on the right. Thus proving the statement of the lemma for every term of this expansion will prove the statement for f.

We fix a nonzero term $\bar{f} = f'_{AC}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j} Q_N^{t_N}$ in the expansion of f and show that the lemma holds for $\bar{f}$. If $c_{N-1} < \bar{s}_{N-1}$ then the above representation is the (M,N)-expansion of $\bar{f}$, and therefore, the statement holds for $\bar{f}$.

Assume that $c_{N-1} \geq \bar{s}_{N-1}$. In the above representation of $\bar{f}$ replace $Q_{N-1}^{\bar{s}_{N-1}}$ with $x^{-\bar{r}_{N-1,0}}(\bar{\mu}_{N-1} x^{\bar{n}_{N-1,0}} \prod_{i=1}^{\bar{m}_{N-1}} P_i^{\bar{n}_{N-1,i}} \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{\bar{l}_{N-1,j}} + Q_N)$. Denote $f''_{AC} = x^{-\bar{r}_{N-1,0}} f'_{AC}(x)$ and $f'''_{AC} = \bar{\mu}_{N-1} x^{\bar{n}_{N-1,0}} f''_{AC}(x)$ to simplify notation. Furthermore, set

$$f_1 = f'''_{AC} \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a'_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j + \bar{l}_{N-1,j}} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1} - \bar{s}_{N-1}} Q_N^{t_N} ,$$

where $a'_i = a_i + \bar{n}_{N-1,i}$ if $i \le \bar{m}_{N-1}$ and $a'_i = a_i$ if $i > \bar{m}_{N-1}$, and

$$f_2 = f''_{AC} \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}-\bar{s}_{N-1}} Q_N^{t_N+1}.$$

Then $f''_{AC}, f'''_{AC} \in k[x]$, $\mathrm{val}(f_1) = \mathrm{val}(\bar{f})$, $\mathrm{val}(f_2) > \mathrm{val}(\bar{f})$ and $\bar{f} = f_1 + f_2$. Our next step is to apply the inductive hypothesis to f_1 and f_2. We notice that by Corollary 6.5 we have $\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j}) \le \deg_z f' = D$.

Let K_1 and K_2 be the powers of x appearing in the (M,N)-expansions for f_1 and f_2, respectively. We set $K = \max(K_1, K_2)$, so that the powers of x appearing in the (M,N)-expansions for $x^K f_1$ and $x^K f_2$ are both 0.

Since $\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}-\bar{s}_{N-1}}) < \deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j})$ it follows that $\nu_{M,N}(x^K f_2) = \mathrm{val}(x^K f_2) > \mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$ and all terms in the (M,N)-expansion of $x^K f_2$ have values greater than $\mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$. To apply the inductive hypothesis to $x^K f_1$ we notice that

$$\deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j+\bar{l}_{N-1,j}} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}-\bar{s}_{N-1}}) < \deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-2} Q_j^{c_j} Q_{N-1}^{c_{N-1}-s_{N-1}+1}) \le \deg_z(\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j})$$

Thus $\nu_{M,N}(x^K f_1) = \mathrm{val}(x^K f_1) = \mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$ and only one term in the (M,N)-expansion of $x^K f_1$ has value $\mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$. Moreover, the powers of P_M and Q_N in this unique term coincide with the powers of P_M and Q_N in f_1. This shows that the (M,N)-expansion of $x^K \bar{f}$ has a unique term of value $\mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$ and the powers of P_M and Q_N in this term are $a'_M = a_M$ and t_N, respectively. All other terms in the (M,N)-expansion of $x^K \bar{f}$ are of greater value, in particular, $\nu_{M,N}(x^K \bar{f}) = \mathrm{val}(x^K \bar{f})$. Thus the lemma holds for $x^K \bar{f}$, and therefore it also holds for $\bar{f}$. □

Corollary 6.13. *Suppose that $M, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ are such that $\bar{m}_{N-1} < M$.*

Suppose that $f, g \in k[x,y,z] \setminus \{0\}$ then $\nu_{M,N}(fg) = \nu_{M,N}(f) + \nu_{M,N}(g)$.

Proof. We first notice that if the statement is true for $x^L f$ and $x^L g$ for some $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ then it is also true for f and g. Consider the (M,N)-expansions

$$x^{K_1} f = \sum_{a_M=0}^{q_f} \sum_{c_N=0}^{s_f} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \le a_i < q_i \\ 0 \le c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{c_j} \right) P_M^{a_M} Q_N^{c_N}$$

and

$$x^{K_2} g = \sum_{\bar{a}_M=0}^{q_g} \sum_{\bar{c}_N=0}^{s_g} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \le \bar{a}_i < q_i \\ 0 \le \bar{c}_j < \bar{s}_j}} g_{\bar{A}C}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} P_i^{\bar{a}_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} Q_j^{\bar{c}_j} \right) P_M^{\bar{a}_M} Q_N^{\bar{c}_N}.$$

After possibly multiplying f and g by some power of x we may assume that $K_1 = 0$, $K_2 = 0$ and the power of x appearing on the left hand side in the (M,N)-expansion of $f_{AC}(x) g_{\bar{A}C}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i+\bar{a}_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j+\bar{c}_j}$ is 0 for all AC and $\bar{A}C$ as above.

Let $I_f = \{AC \mid \nu_{M,N}(f) = \mathrm{val}(f_{AC}\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j})\}$ and $AC_f \in I_f$ be such that $((a_M)_f, (c_N)_f) = \min\{(a_M, c_N) \mid AC \in I_f\}$. We claim that $((a_M)_f, (c_N)_f) < (a_M, c_N)$ for any $AC \in I_f \setminus \{AC_f\}$. Indeed, assume that $AC, AC' \in I_f$ are such that $a_M = a'_M$ and $c_N = c'_N$. Then since

$$\mathrm{ord}(f_{AC})\beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} a_i\beta_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} c_j\bar{\gamma}_j = \mathrm{ord}(f_{AC'})\beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} a'_i\beta_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} c'_j\bar{\gamma}_j$$

by Lemma 3.1 we have $a_i = a'_i$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for all i, j in the range. Thus $AC = AC'$.

Similarly let $I_g = \{\bar{AC} \mid \nu_{M,N}(g) = \mathrm{val}(g_{\bar{AC}}\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{\bar{a}_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{\bar{c}_j})\}$ and $\bar{AC}_g \in I_g$ be such that $((\bar{a}_M)_g, (\bar{c}_N)_g) = \min\{(\bar{a}_M, \bar{c}_N) \mid \bar{AC} \in I_g\}$. Then $((\bar{a}_M)_g, (\bar{c}_N)_g) < (\bar{a}_M, \bar{c}_N)$ for any $\bar{AC} \in I_g \setminus \{\bar{AC}_g\}$.

Notice that $fg = \sum_{AC,\bar{AC}}\left(f_{AC}(x)g_{\bar{AC}}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i+\bar{a}_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j+\bar{c}_j}\right)$ and the (M,N)-expansion of fg can be obtained by adding the (M,N)-expansions of all terms on the right. Let $h = f_{AC_f}(x)g_{\bar{AC}_g}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{(a_i)_f+(\bar{a}_i)_g}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{(c_j)_f+(\bar{c}_j)_g}$ and notice that $\mathrm{val}(h) = \mathrm{val}(f_{AC_f}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{(a_i)_f}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{(c_j)_f}) + \mathrm{val}(g_{\bar{AC}_g}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{(\bar{a}_i)_g}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{(\bar{c}_j)_g}) = \nu_{M,N}(f) + \nu_{M,N}(g)$.

By Lemma 6.12 the (M,N)-expansion of h has a unique term of value $\nu_{M,N}(f) + \nu_{M,N}(g)$ and, moreover, the powers of P_M and Q_N in this term are $(a_M)_f + (\bar{a}_M)_g$ and $(c_N)_f + (\bar{c}_N)_g$, respectively. We claim that if $AC \neq AC_f$ or $\bar{AC} \neq \bar{AC}_g$ then the (M,N)-expansion of $f_{AC}g_{\bar{AC}}\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i+\bar{a}_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j+\bar{c}_j}$ does not have a term of value $\mathrm{val}(h)$ such that its powers of P_M and Q_N are $(a_M)_f + (\bar{a}_M)_g$ and $(c_N)_f + (\bar{c}_N)_g$, respectively. Indeed, set $h' = f_{AC}(x)g_{\bar{AC}}(x)\prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i+\bar{a}_i}\prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j+\bar{c}_j}$. If $AC \notin I_f$ or $\bar{AC}_g \notin I_G$ then $\mathrm{val}(h') > \mathrm{val}(h)$ and, therefore, all terms in the (M,N)-expansion of h' have values greater than $\mathrm{val}(h)$. If $AC \in I_f$ and $\bar{AC} \in I_g$ then $\mathrm{val}(h') = \mathrm{val}(h)$ and the only term of value $\mathrm{val}(h)$ in the (M,N)-expansion of h' has powers of P_M and Q_N equal to $a_M + \bar{a}_M$ and $c_N + \bar{c}_N$, respectively. Then if $AC \neq AC_f$ or $\bar{AC} \neq \bar{AC}_g$ we have $((a_M)_f + (\bar{a}_M)_g, (c_N)_f + (\bar{c}_N)_g) < (a_M + \bar{a}_M, c_N + \bar{c}_N)$. This shows that the unique term of minimal value $\mathrm{val}(h)$ from the (M,N)-expansion of h will not cancel in the (M,N)-expansion of fg. Moreover, all other terms in the (M,N)-expansion of fg will be of value greater than or equal to $\mathrm{val}(h)$. Thus $\nu_{M,N}(fg) = \mathrm{val}(h) = \nu_{M,N}(f) + \nu_{M,N}(g)$. □

Corollary 6.14. *If $f, g \in k[x,y,z] \setminus \{0\}$ then $\nu(fg) = \nu(f) + \nu(g)$.*

Proof. Let $M, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be such that $\nu(f) = \nu_{M,N}(f)$, $\nu(g) = \nu_{M,N}(g)$, $\nu(fg) = \nu_{M,N}(fig)$ and $M > \bar{m}_{N-1}$. Then the statement follows from Corollary 6.13. □

We now extend ν to $k(x,y,z)\setminus\{0\}$. If $f \in k(x,y,z)\setminus\{0\}$ and $f_1, f_2 \in k[x,y,z]\setminus\{0\}$ are such that $f = f_1/f_2$ then $\nu(f) = \nu(f_1) - \nu(f_2)$. Due to Corollary 6.14 $\nu(f)$ does not depend on representation $f = f_1/f_2$. Thus ν is well defined on $k(x,y,z) \setminus \{0\}$.

Moreover, if $f, g \in k(x, y, z) \setminus \{0\}$ then $\nu(f+g) \geq \min(\nu(f), \nu(g))$ and $\nu(fg) = \nu(f)\nu(g)$. Thus ν is a valuation on $k(x, y, z)$.

Lemma 6.15. *Suppose that $f \in k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ is not equal to 0. Then $\nu(f) \geq 0$ and $\nu(f) > 0$ if and only if f lies in the maximal ideal of $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$.*

Proof. Assume that $f \in k[x, y, z]$ then $f = e_1 f_1 + e_2 f_2 + \cdots + e_n f_n$, where for each i we have $f_i = x^{a_i} y^{b_i} z^{c_i}$ is a monomial in x, y, z; $e_i \in k \setminus \{0\}$ and $(a_i, b_i, c_i) \neq (a_j, b_j, c_j)$ if $i \neq j$. Then $\nu(f) \geq \min(\nu(e_i f_i)) = \min(\mathrm{val}(e_i f_i)) = \min(a_i\beta_0 + b_i\beta_1 + c_i\bar{\gamma}_i) \geq 0$. In particular, if $f \in (x, y, z)k[x, y, z]$ then $a_i + b_i + c_i > 0$ for all i and $\nu(f) > 0$. Finally, if $f \notin (x, y, z)k[x, y, z]$ then $a_i = b_i = c_i = 0$ for some i and since $\nu(f - e_i f_i) > 0$ we have $\nu(f) = \min(\nu(e_i f_i), \nu(f - e_i f_i)) = 0$. □

As a consequence of Lemma 6.15 we get that $\nu : k(x, y, z) \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a valuation on $k(x, y, z)$ dominating $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ with $\nu(P_i) = \beta_i$ and $\nu(Q_i) = \bar{\gamma}_i$ for all i. If $\nu' : k(x, y, z) \to \mathbb{Q}$ is another valuation dominating $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ such that $\nu'(P_i) = \beta_i$ and $\nu'(Q_i) = \bar{\gamma}_i$ for all i then we check that $\nu'(f) = \nu(f)$ for any $f \in k[x, y, z] \setminus \{0\}$. To this end we fix $f \in k[x, y, z] \setminus \{0\}$, consider its representation (6.6)

$$x^K f = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq a_i < q_i \\ 0 \leq c_j < \bar{s}_j}} f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}.$$

and evaluate ν' of every term on the right. Since ν' dominates $k[x, y, z]_{(x,y,z)}$ we have $\nu'(a) = 0$ for all $a \in k \setminus \{0\}$ and $\nu'(f_{AC}(x)) = \mathrm{ord}(f_{AC})\beta_0$ provided $f_{AC}(x) \neq 0$. Thus, if $f_{AC}(x) \neq 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu'(f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}) &= \mathrm{ord}(f_{AC})\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j \beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j \bar{\gamma}_j \\ &= \mathrm{val}(f_{AC}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c_j}), \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.2 there exist a unique term $AC' = (a'_1, \ldots, a'_M, c'_1, \ldots, c'_N)$ such that

$$\mathrm{ord}(f'_{AC})\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{M} a'_j \beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c'_j \bar{\gamma}_j = \\ \min\{\mathrm{ord}(f_{AC})\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j \beta_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j \bar{\gamma}_j \mid f_{AC}(x) \neq 0\}.$$

Thus $\nu'(f) = -K\beta_0 + \nu'(f_{AC'}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M} P_i^{a'_i} \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j^{c'_j}) = \nu(f)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

7. MAIN EXAMPLE

In this section we provide an example of valuation centered in $k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)}$. We use defining polynomials to construct a valuation and then work with the sequence of jumping polynomials to describe its value semigroup. In this example only one member of the sequence $\{\bar{r}_{i,0}\}_{i\geq 0}$ is greater than 0.

Example 7.1. Let $\beta_0 = 1$, $\beta_1 = 1\frac{1}{2}$, $\beta_2 = 3\frac{1}{4}$, $\beta_3 = 6\frac{5}{8}, \dots$ and $\bar{\gamma}_1 = 2\frac{1}{4}$, $\bar{\gamma}_2 = 4\frac{1}{3}$, $\bar{\gamma}_3 = 13\frac{1}{9}$, $\bar{\gamma}_4 = 39\frac{10}{27}\dots$, where $\beta_i = 2\beta_{i-1} + \frac{1}{2^i}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} = 3\bar{\gamma}_i + \frac{1}{3^i}$ for all $i > 1$. Then for all $i \geq 1$ in notation of section 5 we have

$$G_i = \frac{1}{2^i}\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{H}_{i+1} = \frac{1}{4\cdot 3^i}\mathbb{Z}, \quad \text{while} \quad G_0 = \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{H}_1 = \frac{9}{4}\mathbb{Z}.$$

So $q_i = 2$ for all $i > 0$ and $\bar{s}_1 = 1$, $\bar{m}_1 = 2$, and $\bar{s}_i = 3$, $\bar{m}_i = 2$ for all $i > 1$. Since $\bar{\gamma}_1 = -\beta_0 + \beta_2$ we have $\bar{r}_{1,0} = 1$. Also notice that $2\beta_1 = 3\beta_0$ and $2\beta_i = 5\cdot 2^{i-2}\beta_0 + \beta_{i-1}$ for all $i > 1$, and $3\bar{\gamma}_2 = 13\beta_0$ and $3\bar{\gamma}_i = 35\cdot 3^{i-3}\beta_0 + \bar{\gamma}_{i-1}$ for all $i > 2$. In particular, this shows $\bar{r}_{i,0} = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$.

Let $\lambda_i = \bar{\mu}_i = 1$ for all $i > 0$. Since the inequalities $\beta_{i+1} > q_i\beta_i$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} > \bar{r}_{i,0}\beta_0 + \bar{s}_i\bar{\gamma}_i$ are satisfied for all $i > 0$ the set of polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ as constructed in section 5 defines a valuation ν on $k(x,y,z)$.

We have $P_0 = x$, $P_1 = y$, $P_2 = y^2 - x^3$ and $Q_1 = z$, $Q_2 = xz - P_2$, $Q_3 = Q_2^3 - x^{13}$. The recursive formulas for P_i and Q_{i+1} when $i > 2$ are

$$P_i = P_{i-1}^2 - x^{5\cdot 2^{i-3}}P_{i-2}$$
$$Q_{i+1} = Q_i^3 - x^{35\cdot 3^{i-3}}Q_{i-1}.$$

We will construct several first members of the subsequence $\{T_i\}_{i>0}$ of jumping polynomials to understand the pattern for nonredundant jumping polynomials. We use (M,N)-expansions to find the required values and residues.

Since $T_1 = z$ we get $\gamma_1 = 2\frac{1}{4}$, $s_1 = 1$, $m_1 = 2$, $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{(1,0,0,1),(0,0,0,2),(0,0,1,1)\}$ and $\delta_1 = 3$. Since $xT_1 = P_2 + Q_2$ we have

$$T_1^2 = x^3P_1 + x^{-2}(P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2), \quad P_2T_1 = x^4P_1 + x^{-1}(P_3 + P_2Q_2).$$

Thus the immediate successors of T_1 are

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= xT_1 - P_2 = Q_2, & \gamma_2 &= \nu(T_2) = 4\tfrac{1}{3}\\ T_3 &= T_1^2 - x^3P_1 = x^{-2}(P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2), & \gamma_3 &= \nu(T_3) = 4\tfrac{5}{8}\\ T_4 &= P_2T_1 - x^4P_1 = x^{-1}(P_3 + P_2Q_2), & \gamma_4 &= \nu(T_4) = 5\tfrac{5}{8}\end{aligned}$$

We notice that γ_4 is a dependent value. Moreover, $T_4 = xT_3 - T_1T_2$. From further computations it will follow that xT_3 and T_1T_2 are both irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and therefore, T_4 is redundant by Lemma 4.12.

Consider T_2 and $\gamma_2 = 4\frac{1}{3}$. We have $s_2 = 3$, $m_2 = 2$, $r_{2,0} = 0$, $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{(0,0,0,0,3)\}$ and $\delta_2 = 1$. The only immediate successor of T_2 is

$$T_5 = T_2^3 - x^{13} = Q_3, \qquad \gamma_5 = \nu(T_5) = 13\frac{1}{9}$$

Consider T_3 and $\gamma_3 = 4\frac{5}{8}$. We have $s_3 = 1$, $m_3 = 3$, $r_{3,0} = 2$, $\delta_3 = 4$ and $\mathcal{D}_3 = \{(2,0,0,0,0,0,1),(1,0,1,0,0,0,1),(0,0,0,0,0,0,2),(0,0,0,1,0,0,1)\}$. Since $x^2T_3 = P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2$ we get

$$T_3^2 = x^6P_2 + x^{-4}(P_4 + 4P_2P_3Q_2 + hvt), \quad P_3T_3 = x^8P_2 + x^{-2}(P_4 + 2P_2P_3Q_2 + hvt).$$

Also

$$xP_2T_3 = x^{-1}(P_2P_3 + 2x^5P_1Q_2 + 2P_3Q_2 + hvt) \quad \text{and} \quad P_3T_1 = x^{-1}(P_2P_3 + P_3Q_2).$$

Thus the immediate successors of T_3 are

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6 &= x^2T_3 - P_3 = 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2, & \gamma_6 &= \nu(T_6) = 7\tfrac{7}{12}\\
T_7 &= xP_2T_3 - P_3T_1 = 2x^4P_1Q_2 + x^{-1}(P_3Q_2 + hvt), & \gamma_7 &= \nu(T_7) = 9\tfrac{1}{4}\\
T_8 &= T_3^2 - x^6P_2 = x^{-4}(P_4 + 4P_2P_3Q_2 + hvt), & \gamma_8 &= \nu(T_8) = 9\tfrac{5}{16}\\
T_9 &= P_3T_3 - x^8P_2 = x^{-2}(P_4 + 2P_2P_3Q_2 + hvt), & \gamma_9 &= \nu(T_9) = 10\tfrac{5}{16}
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that $\gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_9$ are dependent values. Moreover, T_6, T_7, T_9 are redundant jumping polynomials since $T_6 = 2P_2T_2 + T_2^2$, $T_7 = 2x^4P_1T_2 + xT_2T_3 - T_1T_2^2$ and $T_9 = x^2T_8 - 2P_2T_2T_3 - T_2^2T_3$.

It appears that the following sequence of polynomials $\{R_i\}_{i>0}$ is of interest: $R_1 = T_2 = Q_1$, $R_2 = R_1^2 - x^3P_1$ and $R_i = R_{i-1}^2 - x^{3\cdot 2^{i-2}}P_{i-1}$ for all $i > 2$.

Conjecture 7.2. *Suppose that* $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *is such that* T_j *is a nonredundant jumping polynomial. Then there exists* $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *such that* $T_j = Q_i$ *or* $T_j = R_i$.

We will not provide a proof for the conjecture due to its length and technicality. Instead we will notice the following implication of the conjecture: the value semigroup $\nu(k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)})$ is generated by the set of values $\{\nu(P_i)\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{\nu(Q_i)\}_{i\geq 1} \cup \{\nu(R_i)\}_{i\geq 1}$. This weaker statement will be the main statement of Example 7.1. To prove it we develop some terminology and look at the properties of the sequence $\{R_i\}_{i\geq 1}$.

We say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible monomial in (P_m, Q_n) if f can be written as $\lambda \prod_{i=0}^{m} P_i^{a_i} \prod_{j=2}^{n} Q_j^{b_j}$, where $\lambda \in k$, $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $a_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $b_j \in \{0,1,2\}$ for all $j \geq 2$. Denote the set of all admissible monomials in (P_m, Q_n) by $Mon(P_m, Q_n)$. We say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible monomial in (P_m, Q) if there exists n such that $f \in Mon(P_m, Q_n)$. Denote the set of all admissible monomials in (P_m, Q) by $Mon(P_m, Q)$.

We say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible monomial in (Q_n, R_m) if f can be written as $\lambda x^a y^b \prod_{j=2}^{n} Q_j^{b_j} \prod_{i=1}^{m} R_i^{c_i}$, where $\lambda \in k$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $b_j \in \{0,1,2\}$ for all $j \geq 2$ and $b, c_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \geq 1$. Denote the set of all admissible monomials in (Q_n, R_m) by $Mon(Q_n, R_m)$. We say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible monomial in (Q, R_m) if there exists n such that $f \in Mon(Q_n, R_m)$. Denote the set of all admissible monomials in (Q, R_m) by $Mon(Q, R_m)$. Finally, we say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible monomial in (Q, R) if there exists m such that $f \in Mon(Q, R_m)$. Denote the set of all admissible monomials in (Q, R) by $Mon(Q, R)$.

We say that $f \in k(x,y,z)$ is an admissible polynomial in (P_m, Q_n) (or (P_m, Q), or (Q_n, R_m), or (Q, R_m), or (Q, R)) if f can be written as a sum of admissible monomials in (P_m, Q_n) (or (P_m, Q), or (Q_n, R_m), or (Q, R_m), or (Q, R), respectively). Denote the set of all admissible polynomials in (P_m, Q_n) (or (P_m, Q), or (Q_n, R_m), or (Q, R_m), or (Q, R)) by $Poly(P_m, Q_n)$ (or $Poly(P_m, Q)$, or $Poly(Q_n, R_m)$, or $Poly(Q, R_m)$, or $Poly(Q, R)$, respectively).

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose that* $f, g \in Poly(P_m, Q_1)$ *then* $fg \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q_1)$.

Proof. We notice that if $f, g \in Poly(P_m, Q_1)$ then $f, g \in k[x, y]$ and $\deg_y f < 2^m$, $\deg_y g < 2^m$. Thus $(fg) \in k[x, y]$ and $\deg_y(fg) < 2^{m+1}$. Then the statement follows from Lemma 6.7. □

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose that* $n \geq 2$ *and* $f, g \in Mon(P_0, Q_n)$ *then* $fg = h_1 + h_2 Q_{n+1}$ *where* $h_1, h_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$.

Proof. We use induction on n. If $n = 2$ then $f = \lambda x^a Q_2^b$ and $g = \mu x^r Q_2^t$, where $a, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $b, t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. If $b + t < 3$ then $fg = \lambda\mu x^{a+r} Q_2^{b+t} \in Mon(P_0, Q_2)$. If $b + t \geq 3$ then write $Q_2^{b+t} = (x^{13} + Q_3) Q_2^{b+t-3}$ to get

$$fg = \lambda\mu x^{a+r+13} Q_2^{b+t-3} + \lambda\mu x^{a+r} Q_2^{b+t-3} Q_3 = h_1 + h_2 Q_3,$$

where $h_1, h_2 \in Mon(P_0, Q_2)$.

Assume $n > 2$ then $f = f' Q_n^b$ and $g = g' Q_n^t$, where $f', g' \in Mon(P_0, Q_{n-1})$ and $b, t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. By the inductive hypothesis we have $f'g' = h'_1 + h'_2 Q_n$, where $h'_1, h'_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_{n-1})$. If $b + t < 2$ then $fg = h'_1 Q_n^{b+t} + h'_2 Q_n^{b+t+1} \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$. We write $Q_n^3 = x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1} + Q_{n+1}$ to get the required representation when $b + t \geq 2$.

Assume first that $b + t = 2$ then $fg = h'_1 Q_n^2 + h'_2 (x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1}) + h'_2 Q_{n+1}$. Let $e \in Mon(P_0, Q_{n-1})$ be an admissible monomial in the representation of h'_2. By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$e(x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1}) = e_1 + e_2 Q_n,$$

where $e_1, e_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_{n-1})$. This shows that $h'_2(x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1}) = \bar{h}_1 + \bar{h}_2 Q_n$ for some $\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_{n-1})$. Thus

$$fg = \bar{h}_1 + \bar{h}_2 Q_n + h'_1 Q_n^2 + h'_2 Q_{n+1} = h_1 + h_2 Q_{n+1},$$

where $h_1, h_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$.

Assume now that $b + t \geq 3$ then

$$fg = (h'_1 + h'_2 Q_n) x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1} Q_n^{b+t-3} + (h'_1 Q_n^{b+t-3} + h'_2 Q_n^{b+t-2}) Q_{n+1}.$$

Notice that $b + t - 2 \leq 2$. Thus, if $\bar{h} = h'_1 Q_n^{b+t-3} + h'_2 Q_n^{b+t-2}$ then $\bar{h} \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$. Also if $e \in Mon(P_0, Q_n)$ is an admissible monomial in the expansion of $h'_1 + h'_2 Q_n$ then $e = e' Q_n^a$, where $e' \in Mon(P_0, Q_{n-1})$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$. So, the product of monomials $e' Q_n^a x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1} Q_n^{b+t-3}$ satisfies the condition $b + t - 3 + a \leq 2$. Thus by the argument above we have

$$e x^{35 \cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1} Q_n^{b+t-3} = e_1 + e_2 Q_{n+1},$$

where $e_1, e_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$. This shows that

$$(h'_1 + h'_2 Q_n) x^{35\cdot 3^{n-3}} Q_{n-1} Q_n^{b+t-3} = \bar{h}_1 + \bar{h}_2 Q_{n+1}$$

for some $\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_n)$. Thus, $fg = \bar{h}_1 + (\bar{h}_2 + \bar{h})Q_{n+1}$is the required representation. □

Corollary 7.5. *If $f, g \in Mon(P_m, Q_n)$ then $fg \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q_{n+1})$.*

If $f, g \in Poly(P_m, Q_n)$ then $fg \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q_{n+1})$.

If $f, g \in Poly(P_m, Q)$ then $fg \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q)$.

If $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k \in Poly(P_0, Q)$ then $h_1 h_2 \cdots h_k \in Poly(P_0, Q)$.

Proof. Only the first statement is nontrivial. We notice that if $f, g \in Mon(P_m, Q_n)$ there exist $f_1, g_1 \in Mon(P_m, Q_1)$ and $f_2, g_2 \in Mon(P_0, Q_n)$ such that $f = f_1 f_2$ and $g = g_1 g_2$. Then $f_1 g_1 \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q_1)$ by Lemma 7.3 and $f_2 g_2 \in Poly(P_0, Q_{n+1})$ by Lemma 7.4. Let $e_1 \in Mon(P_{m+1}, Q_1)$ be an admissible monomial in the expansion of $f_1 g_1$ and $e_2 \in Mon(P_0, Q_{n+1})$ be an admissible monomial in the expansion of $f_2 g_2$ then $e_1 e_2 \in Mon(P_{m+1}, Q_{n+1})$. This shows that $fg = f_1 g_1 f_2 g_2 \in Poly(P_{m+1}, Q_{n+1})$. □

In the proof of the next statement the following property of the sequence $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ is used: if $i \geq 2$ then $\beta_{i+1} = \sum_{j=2}^{i} \beta_j + \beta_2 + (1/4 - 1/2^{i+1})$. Indeed, $\beta_3 = \beta_2 + \beta_2 + 1/8$ and for $i > 2$ we have $\beta_{i+1} = 2\beta_i + 1/2^{i+1} = \beta_i + \sum_{j=2}^{i-1} \beta_j + \beta_2 + (1/4 - 1/2^i) + 1/2^{i+1} = \sum_{j=2}^{i} \beta_j + \beta_2 + (1/4 - 1/2^{i+1})$. In particular, $\beta_{i+1} < \sum_{j=2}^{i} \beta_j + 3\frac{1}{2}$ for all $i \geq 2$.

Lemma 7.6. *Suppose that $i \geq 1$ then $x^{2^{i-1}} R_i = P_{i+1} + 2^{i-1} Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i} P_j + h_i$, where $h_i \in Poly(P_i, Q_i)$ and $\nu(h_i) > \nu(Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i} P_j) > \nu(P_{i+1})$.*

In particular, $x^{2^{i-1}} R_i = P_{i+1} + r_i$, where $r_i \in Poly(P_i, Q)$ and $\nu(r_i) > \beta_{i+1}$, and $\nu(R_i) = \beta_{i+1} - 2^{i-1}\beta_0$.

Proof. We use induction on i. If $i = 1$ then, indeed, $xR_i = P_2 + Q_2$ and $\nu(Q_2) > \nu(P_2)$. Assume that $i > 1$ and the statement is true for $i - 1$ then

$$x^{2^{i-1}} R_i = x^{2^{i-1}} (R_{i-1}^2 - x^{3\cdot 2^{i-2}} P_{i-1}) = (P_i + 2^{i-2} Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i-1} P_j + h_{i-1})^2 - x^{5\cdot 2^{i-2}} P_{i-1}$$

$$= (P_i^2 - x^{5\cdot 2^{i-2}} P_{i-1}) + 2^{i-1} Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i} P_j + h_i = P_{i+1} + 2^{i-1} Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i} P_j + h_i,$$

where $h_i = 2^{2i-4} Q_2^2 \prod_{j=2}^{i-1} P_j^2 + 2h_{i-1} P_i + 2^{i-1} h_{i-1} Q_2 \prod_{j=2}^{i-1} P_j + h_{i-1}^2$.

Observe that $\nu(Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i}P_j)=\sum_{j=2}^{i}\beta_j+4\frac{1}{3}>\sum_{j=2}^{i}\beta_j+3\frac{1}{2}>\nu(P_{i+1})$. Also, since

$$\nu(h_{i-1}^2)>\nu(h_{i-1}Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_j)>\nu(h_{i-1}P_i)>\nu(Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_jP_i)$$

$$\text{and}\qquad \nu(Q_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_j^2)>\nu(Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_jP_i)$$

we have $\nu(h_i)>\nu(Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i}P_j)$. We notice that $h_{i-1}P_i\in Poly(P_i,Q_{i-1})$ since the product of every admissible monomial in the representation of h_{i-1} and P_i is an admissible monomial in (P_i,Q_{i-1}). Finally, h_{i-1}^2, $h_{i-1}Q_2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_j$, $Q_2^2\prod_{j=2}^{i-1}P_j^2\in Poly(P_i,Q_i)$ by Corollary 7.5. Thus $h_i\in Poly(P_i,Q_i)$. □

The next corollary is a restatement of Corollary 3.2. To align current notation with notation of section 3 we set $\beta_0'=\beta_0$, $\beta_1'=\beta_1$ and $\beta_i'=\bar{\gamma}_i$ for all $i\geq 2$. Also set $\gamma_i'=\nu(R_i)$ for all $i\geq 1$. Then $q_1'=2$ and $q_i'=3$ for all $i\geq 2$ and $s_i'=2$ for all $i\geq 1$. We notice that $x^{a_0}y^{a_1}\prod_{j=2}^{n}Q_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{m}R_j^{c_j}$ is an admissible monomial in (Q,R) if and only if $(a_0,\ldots,a_n,c_1,\ldots,c_m)$ satisfies the conditions Corollary 3.2.

Corollary 7.7. *Suppose that* $f,g\in Mon(Q,R)$. *Let* $f=x^{a_0}y^{a_1}\prod_{j=2}^{n}Q_j^{a_j}\prod_{j=1}^{m}R_j^{c_j}$ *and* $g=x^{b_0}y^{b_1}\prod_{j=2}^{n}Q_j^{b_j}\prod_{j=1}^{m}R_j^{d_j}$. *If* $(a_0,\ldots,a_n,c_1,\ldots,c_m)\neq(b_0,\ldots,b_n,d_1,\ldots,b_m)$ *then* $\nu(f)\neq\nu(g)$.

It now follows that for $f\in Poly(Q,R)$ to find $\nu(f)$ it is enough to find the minimum of values of admissible monomials in the expansion of f. Our next goal is to show that if $f\in k[x,y,z]$ then $f\in Poly(Q,R)$ and to claim that $\nu(f)$ belongs to the semigroup generated by $\{\nu(x),\nu(y)\}\cup\{\nu(Q_i)\}_{i\geq 2}\cup\{\nu(R_i)\}_{i\geq 1}$.

Lemma 7.8. *Suppose that* $f,g\in Poly(Q,R_m)$ *and* $h\in Poly(P_{m+1},Q)$. *Then* $fg\in Poly(Q,R_{m+1})$ *and* $h\in Poly(Q,R_m)$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the statement under the assumption that f,g and h are admissible monomials. We use induction on m. If $m=0$ then $f=y^bf'$ and $g=y^vg'$, where $f',g'\in Mon(P_0,Q)$ and $b,v\in\{0,1\}$. If $b+v\leq 1$ then $fg=y^{b+v}(f'g')\in Poly(Q,R_0)$, since $f'g'\in Poly(P_0,Q)$ by Corollary 7.5. If $b+v=2$ then

$$fg=(x^3+P_2)f'g'=(x^3-Q_2)f'g'+xf'g'R_1.$$

By Corollary 7.5 we have $(x^3-Q_2)f'g',xf'g'\in Poly(P_0,Q)$ and therefore $xf'g'R_1,fg\in Poly(Q,R_1)$. Also the statement for h holds since $Poly(P_1,Q)=Poly(Q,R_0)$.

Assume that $m\geq 1$. Then $f=f'R_m^c$ and $g=g'R_m^w$, where $f',g'\in Mon(Q,R_{m-1})$ and $c,w\in\{0,1\}$. By the inductive hypothesis we have $f'g'\in Poly(Q,R_m)$. Let $e=e'R_m^a$, where $e'\in Mon(Q,R_{m-1})$ and $a\in\{0,1\}$, be one of the admissible monomials in the expansion of $f'g'$.

If $a+c+w \leq 1$ then $eR_m^{c+w} \in Mon(Q, R_m)$. If $a+c+w=2$ then

$$eR_m^{c+w} = e'(x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}P_m + R_{m+1}) = x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_m + e'R_{m+1}.$$

We have $P_m \in Poly(Q, R_{m-1})$ by the inductive hypothesis, $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e' \in Mon(Q, R_{m-1})$ and $e'R_{m+1} \in Mon(Q, R_{m+1})$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the product of P_m and $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'$ we get $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_m \in Poly(Q, R_m)$. Thus $eR_m^{c+w} \in Poly(Q, R_{m+1})$.

If $a+c+w=3$ then

$$eR_m^{c+w} = e'R_m(x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}P_m + R_{m+1}) = x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_mR_m + e'R_mR_{m+1}$$

We have $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_m \in Poly(Q, R_m)$ by the above argument, and $e'R_mR_{m+1} \in Mon(Q, R_{m+1})$. Let $d = d'R_m^b$, where $d' \in Mon(Q, R_{m-1})$ and $b \in \{0,1\}$, be one of the admissible monomials in the expansion of $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_m$. Then the product $dR_m = d'R_m^bR_m$ satisfies the condition that $b+1 \leq 2$ and therefore, $dR_m \in Poly(Q, R_{m+1})$ as shown above. This shows that $x^{3\cdot 2^{m-1}}e'P_mR_m \in Poly(Q, R_{m+1})$ and therefore, $eR_m^{c+w} \in Poly(Q, R_{m+1})$. Thus $fg \in Poly(Q, R_{m+1})$.

We now show that $h \in Poly(Q, R_m)$. If $h \in Mon(P_m, Q)$ then $h \in Poly(Q, R_{m-1})$ by the inductive hypothesis. Assume that $h \notin Mon(P_m, Q)$, then $h = h'P_{m+1}$, where $h' \in Mon(P_m, Q)$. Applying Lemma 7.8 and the inductive hypothesis we get

$$h = x^{2^{m-1}}h'R_m - h'r_m,$$

where $h', r_m \in Poly(Q, R_{m-1})$ and $x^{2^{m-1}}h'R_m \in Poly(Q, R_m)$. Finally,by the inductive hypothesis $h'r_m \in Poly(Q, R_m)$ and, therefore, $h \in Poly(Q, R_m)$. □

The following statement follows at once from Lemma 7.8

Corollary 7.9. *If* $f_1, f_2, \dots f_k \in Poly(Q, R)$ *then* $f_1f_2\cdots f_k \in Poly(Q, R)$.

We can now completely describe the value semigroup of ν.

Theorem 7.10. $\nu(k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)})$ *is a semigroup generated by* $\{1, 1\frac{1}{2}, 2\frac{1}{4}, 4\frac{5}{8}, \dots\} \cup \{4\frac{1}{3}, 13\frac{1}{9}, 39\frac{10}{29}, \dots\}$.

Proof. Let S be the semigroup generated by the set in the statement of the theorem. It suffices to show that $\nu(f) \in S$ for every $f \in k[x,y,z]$. We write $f = f_1 + \cdots + f_l$, where for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ we have $f_i = \lambda_i x^{a_i}y^{b_i}z^{c_i}$ with $\lambda_i \in k$ and $a_i, b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Since $f_i = (\lambda_i x^{a_i} y)(y)\dots(y)(R_1)\dots(R_1)$ by Corollary 7.9 we have $f_i \in Poly(Q, R)$. Therefore, $f \in Poly(Q, R)$. Thus, by Corollary 7.7 $\nu(f) \in S$. □

8. More examples of semigroups of valuations centered in a 3-dimensional regular local ring

In this section we construct two more examples of valuations centered in $k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)}$. We use defining polynomials to construct a valuation on $k(x,y,z)$ and then consider a sequence of jumping polynomials to understand its value semigroup. In the first example the set $\{\bar{r}_{i,0} | \bar{r}_{i,0} > 0\}$ is empty and generators of the value semigroup are the values of defining polynomials. In the second example the set $\{\bar{r}_{i,0}|\bar{r}_{i,0} > 0\}$ has two elements. We observe that already in the case of just two $\bar{r}_{i,0}$ greater than zero the pattern for the sequence of generators of the value semigroup becomes quite complicated.

Example 8.1. Let $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ and $\{\beta'_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ be sequences of positive rational numbers such that $\beta_0 = \beta'_0$. Using notation of section 4 for all $i \geq 0$ we set

$$S_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad G_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta_j \mathbb{Z}, \qquad\qquad q_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | q\beta_i \in G_{i-1}\}$$

$$S'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad G'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta'_j \mathbb{Z}, \qquad\qquad q'_i = \min\{q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | q\beta'_i \in G'_{i-1}\}$$

We assume that $\gcd(q_i, q'_j) = 1$ for all $i, j > 0$ and require $\beta_{i+1} > q_i\beta_i$ and $\beta'_{i+1} > q'_i\beta'_i$ for all $i > 0$. We also assume that infinitely many q_i and q'_i are greater than 1.

To construct a defining sequence of polynomials, for all $i > 0$ we set $\bar{\gamma}_i = \beta'_i$ and fix $\lambda_i, \bar{\mu}_i \in k \setminus \{0\}$. Then for all $i > 0$ we have

$$\bar{H}_i + G = (\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q_j} \prod_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{q'_j})\beta_0\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{ and } \quad \bar{H}_i + G_0 = (\prod_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{q'_j})\beta_0\mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus $\bar{s}_i = q'_i$ and $\bar{m}_i = 0$ for all $i > 0$. By Corollary 3.3 applied to $\bar{s}_i\bar{\gamma}_i = q'_i\beta'_i$, an element of $(G_0 + \bar{H}_{i-1}) = G'_{i-1}$, we get $a_i > 0$ and $\bar{n}_{i,0} = a_i$, $\bar{r}_{i,0} = 0$ for all $i > 0$. We notice that $\bar{s}_i\bar{\gamma}_i \in (S_0 + \bar{U}_{i-1})$ for all $i > 0$. Also, the inequality $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} > \bar{r}_{i,0}\beta_0 + \bar{s}_i\bar{\gamma}_i$ holds for all $i > 0$. Therefore, the set of polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ as constructed in section 5 defines a valuation ν on $k(x, y, z)$.

We claim that in this case the sequence of jumping polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{T_i\}_{i>0}$ for ν as defined in section 2 coinsides with the sequence of defining polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{Q_i\}_{i>0}$. We use induction on i to show that $T_i = Q_i$, $\delta_{i-1} = 1$, $m_{i-1} = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{P} \cup \{Q_j^{q'_j}\}_{j=1}^{i-1}$ for all $i > 0$. If $i = 1$ the statetemnt holds.

Assume that $i > 0$ and $T_j = Q_j$, $\delta_{j-1} = 1$, $m_{j-1} = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}_j = \mathcal{P} \cup \{Q_j^{q'_e}\}_{e=1}^{j-1}$ for all $0 < j \leq i$. Then $\gamma_j = \bar{\gamma}_j$ for all $0 < j \leq i$ and $H_{i-1} = \bar{H}_{i-1}$, $U_{i-1} = \bar{U}_{i-1}$. Thus we have $s_i = \bar{s}_i$, $m_i = \bar{m}_i = 0$ and $s_i\gamma_i \in (S_0 + U_{i-1})$. This implies $\delta_i = 1$, $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)\}$=$\{\bar{d}\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_i \cup \{Q_i^{q'_i}\} = \mathcal{P} \cup \{Q_j^{q'_j}\}_{j=1}^{i}$. Also, the only immediate successor of T_i is T_{i+1} since $\sum_{j=0}^{i} \delta_j = i + 1$.

Finally, to show that $T_{i+1} = Q_{i+1}$ we notice that if $\bar{n}_{i,0}, \bar{l}_{i,1}, \ldots, \bar{l}_{i,i-1}$ are as defined in the construction of Q_{i+1} then $s_i\gamma_i = \bar{n}_{i,0}\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{l}_{i,j}\gamma_j$ and $P_0^{\bar{n}_{i,0}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{\bar{l}_{i,j}}$ is irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}_i$ since $\bar{l}_{i,j} < q'_j$ for all $j \leq i - 1$. Then by uniqueness of such a representation (Proposition 4.3) we have $n_{\bar{d},0} = \bar{n}_{i,0}$ and $l_{\bar{d},j} = \bar{l}_{i,j}$ for all $j \leq i-1$. Then $T_i^{s_i}/(P_0^{n_{\bar{d},0}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}}) = Q_i^{\bar{s}_i}/(P_0^{\bar{n}_{i,0}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} Q_j^{\bar{l}_{i,j}})$ and therefore, $\mu_{\bar{d}} = \bar{\mu}_i$.

Thus

$$T_{i+1} = T_i^{s_i} - \mu_{\bar{d}} P_0^{n_{\bar{d},0}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} T_j^{l_{\bar{d},j}} = Q_i^{\bar{s}_i} - \bar{\mu}_i P_0^{\bar{n}_{i,0}} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} Q_j^{\bar{l}_{i,j}} = Q_{i+1}.$$

In this example $\{\beta_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{\beta_i'\}_{i>0}$ is a set of generators for the value semigroup $\nu(k[x,y,z]_{(x,y,z)})$. It is also a minimal set of generators if $q_i > 1$ and $q_i' > 1$ for all $i > 0$.

An example of this kind with $q_i = 2$ and $q_i' = 3$ for all $i > 0$ has been considered in [2]. Also, the sequence $\{\beta_i\}_{i>0} \cup \{\bar{\gamma}_i\}_{i>0}$ of example 8.1 satisfies the positivity condition of [13].

Example 8.2. Let $\beta_0 = 1$, $\beta_1 = 1\frac{1}{2}$, $\beta_2 = 3\frac{1}{4}$, $\beta_3 = 6\frac{5}{8}, \dots$ and $\bar{\gamma}_1 = 2\frac{1}{4}$, $\bar{\gamma}_2 = 3\frac{5}{8}$, $\bar{\gamma}_3 = 7\frac{1}{3}$, $\bar{\gamma}_4 = 22\frac{1}{9}, \dots$, where $\beta_i = 2\beta_{i-1} + \frac{1}{2^i}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} = 3\bar{\gamma}_i + \frac{1}{3^{i-1}}$ for all $i > 2$. Then for all $i > 0$ in notation of section 5 we have

$$G_0 = \mathbb{Z}, \quad G_i = \frac{1}{2^i}\mathbb{Z} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bar{H}_1 = \frac{9}{4}\mathbb{Z}, \quad \bar{H}_2 = \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{Z}, \quad \bar{H}_{i+2} = \frac{1}{8\cdot 3^i}\mathbb{Z}$$

So $q_i = 2$ for all $i > 0$ and $\bar{s}_1 = 1$, $\bar{m}_1 = 2$, $\bar{s}_2 = 1$, $\bar{m}_2 = 3$ and $\bar{s}_i = 3$, $\bar{m}_i = 3$ for all $i > 2$. Notice that $\bar{\gamma}_1 = -\beta_0 + \beta_2$ and $\bar{\gamma}_2 = -3\beta_0 + \beta_3$, so that $\bar{r}_{1,0} = 1$ and $\bar{r}_{2,0} = 3$. Also, $2\beta_1 = 3\beta_0$ and $2\beta_i = 5\cdot 2^{i-2}\beta_0 + \beta_{i-1}$ for all $i > 1$, and $3\bar{\gamma}_3 = 22\beta_0$ and $3\bar{\gamma}_i = 59\cdot 3^{i-4}\beta_0 + \bar{\gamma}_{i-1}$ for all $i > 3$. In particular, this shows $\bar{r}_{i,0} = 0$ for all $i \geq 3$.

Let $\lambda_i = \bar{\mu}_i = 1$ for all $i > 0$. Since the inequalities $\beta_{i+1} > q_i\beta_i$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} > \bar{r}_{i,0}\beta_0 + \bar{s}_i\bar{\gamma}_i$ are satisfied for all $i > 0$ the set of polynomials $\{P_i\}_{i\geq 0} \cup \{Q_i\}_{i>0}$ as constructed in section 5 defines a valuation ν on $k(x,y,z)$.

We have $P_0 = x$, $P_1 = y$, $P_2 = y^2 - x^3$, $P_3 = P_2^2 - x^5 y$ and $Q_1 = z$, $Q_2 = xz - P_2$, $Q_3 = x^3 Q_2 - P_3$, $Q_4 = Q_3^3 - x^{22}$. The recursive formulas for P_i and Q_{i+1} when $i > 3$ are

$$P_i = P_{i-1}^2 - x^{5\cdot 2^{i-3}} P_{i-2}$$
$$Q_{i+1} = Q_i^3 - x^{59\cdot 3^{i-4}} Q_{i-1}.$$

We will directly compute several first members of the subsequence $\{T_i\}_{i>0}$ of jumping polynomials and identify the value semigroup generators with values less than 9. We use (M,N)-expansions to find the required values and residues.

Since $T_1 = z$ we get $\gamma_1 = 2\frac{1}{4}$, $s_1 = 1$, $m_1 = 2$, $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{(1,0,0,1),(0,0,0,2),(0,0,1,1)\}$ and $\delta_1 = 3$. Since $xT_1 = P_2 + Q_2$ we have

$$T_1^2 = x^3 P_1 + x^{-2}(P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2), \quad P_2T_1 = x^4P_1 + x^{-1}(P_3 + P_2Q_2).$$

Thus the immediate successors of T_1 are

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_2 = xT_1 - P_2 = Q_2, && \gamma_2 = 3\tfrac{5}{8}\\
&T_3 = T_1^2 - x^3P_1 = x^{-2}(P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2), && \gamma_3 = 4\tfrac{5}{8}\\
&T_4 = P_2T_1 - x^4P_1 = x^{-1}(P_3 + P_2Q_2), && \gamma_4 = 5\tfrac{5}{8}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider T_2 and $\gamma_2 = 3\frac{5}{8}$. We have $s_2 = 1$, $m_2 = 3$, $r_{2,0} = 3$, $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{(3,0,0,0,0,1), (0,0,0,0,0,2), (2,0,1,0,0,1), (0,0,0,1,0,1)\}$ and $\delta_2 = 4$. Since $x^3T_2 = P_3 + Q_3$ we get

$$T_2^2 = x^4P_2 + x^{-6}(P_4 + 2P_3Q_3 + Q_3^2), \quad P_3T_2 = x^7P_2 + x^{-3}(P_4 + P_3Q_3).$$

Also

$$x^2P_2T_2 = x^{-1}(P_2P_3 + P_2Q_3) \text{ and } P_3T_1 = x^{-1}(P_2P_3 + P_3Q_2).$$

Thus the immediate successors of T_2 are

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_5 = x^3T_2 - P_3 = Q_3, && \gamma_5 = 7\tfrac{1}{3}\\
&T_6 = T_2^2 - x^4P_2 = x^{-6}(P_4 + 2P_3Q_3 + Q_3^2), && \gamma_6 = 7\tfrac{5}{16}\\
&T_7 = x^2P_2T_2 - P_3T_1 = x^{-1}(-P_3Q_2 + P_2Q_3), && \gamma_7 = 9\tfrac{1}{4}\\
&T_8 = P_3T_2 - x^7P_2 = x^{-3}(P_4 + P_3Q_3), && \gamma_8 = 10\tfrac{5}{16}
\end{aligned}$$

It is helpful to notice that since $P_3 = x^3T_2 - T_5$ we can also write $T_8 = x^3T_6 - T_2T_5$. From further computations it will follow that x^3T_6 and T_2T_5 are both irreducible with respect to $\mathcal{T}$, and therefore, T_8 is redundant by Lemma 4.12. Also, the only successors of T_8 are $T_{k_1} = -T_2T_5$ and $T_{k_2} = 0$, where $k_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{8} \delta_j$ and $k_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} \delta_j$. A similar argument applies to T_7. Since $P_2 = xT_1 - T_2$ and $T_2^2 = x^4P_2 + T_6$ we write $T_7 = -x^6P_2 - x^2T_6 + T_1T_5$ to see that T_7 is redundant.

Consider T_3 and $\gamma_3 = 4\frac{5}{8}$. We have $s_3 = 1$, $m_3 = 3$, $\mathcal{D}_3 = \{(0,0,0,0,0,0,1))\}$ and $\delta_3 = 1$. Since $x^2T_3 = P_3 + 2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2$ and $x^3T_2 = P_3 + Q_3$ the only immediate successor of T_3 is

$$T_9 = T_3 - xT_2 = x^{-2}(2P_2Q_2 + Q_2^2 - Q_3), \qquad \gamma_9 = 4\frac{7}{8}$$

Continuing in this manner we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{10} = T_4 - x^2T_2 = x^{-1}(P_2Q_2 - Q_3), && \gamma_{10} = 5\tfrac{7}{8}\\
&T_{11} = T_5^3 - x^{22} = Q_4, && \gamma_{11} = 22\tfrac{1}{9}\\
&T_{12} = x^6T_6 - P_4 = 2P_3T_5 + T_5^2, && \gamma_{12} = 13\tfrac{23}{24}\\
&T_{13} = T_6^2 - x^8P_3 = x^{-12}(P_5 + hvt), && \gamma_{13} = 14\tfrac{21}{32}\\
&T_{14} = x^5P_2T_6 - P_4T_1 = -x^2P_3T_6 + 2P_3T_1T_5 - x^2T_5T_6 + T_1T_5^2, && \gamma_{14} = 15\tfrac{15}{16}\\
&T_{15} = x^3P_3T_6 - P_4T_2 = 2x^7P_2T_5 + x^3T_5T_6 - T_2T_5^2, && \gamma_{15} = 17\tfrac{7}{12}\\
&T_{16} = P_4T_6 - x^{14}P_3 = x^6T_{13} - 2P_3T_5T_6 + T_5^2T_6, && \gamma_{16} = 13\tfrac{23}{24}\\
&T_{17} = T_7 + x^6P_2 = -x^2T_6 + T_1T_5, && \gamma_{17} = 9\tfrac{5}{16}\\
&T_{18} = T_8 - x^3T_6 = -T_2T_5, && \gamma_{18} = 10\tfrac{23}{24}
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we see that $T_{12}, T_{14}, \ldots, T_{18}$ are redundant and T_{11}, T_{13} are of value greater than 9. It follows that the value semigroup generators of value less than 9 may only appear among values of the successors of T_9 and T_{10}. Moreover, only jumping polynomials of value less than 9 may be used to construct such successors of T_9 and T_{10}. From now on we will only keep track of successors of T_9 and T_{10} with values less than 9.

Immediate successors of T_9 of value less than 9 may only have initial terms xT_9, T_1T_9, P_2T_9 or T_2T_9, since all other immediate successors of T_9 will have initial terms of value greater than 9. T_{10} has only one immediate successor as γ_{10} is a dependent value.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&T_{9:1} = xT_9 - 2T_1T_2 = -x^{-1}(Q_2^2 + Q_3), && \gamma_{9:1} = 6\tfrac{1}{4}\\
&T_{9:2} = T_1T_9 - 2x^2P_1T_2 = x^{-3}(2P_3Q_2 + 3P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + Q_2^3 - Q_2Q_3), && \gamma_{9:2} = 7\tfrac{1}{4}\\
&T_{9:3} = P_2T_9 - 2P_1P_3 = x^{-2}(2P_3Q_2 + P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + 2x^2P_1Q_3), && \gamma_{9:3} = 8\tfrac{1}{4}\\
&T_{9:4} = T_2T_9 - 2x^7P_1 = x^{-2}(2P_2T_6 + 2x^4P_3 + Q_2^3 - Q_2Q_3), && \gamma_{9:4} = 8\tfrac{9}{16}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
T_{10:1} = T_{10} - T_1T_2 = -x^{-1}(Q_2^2 + Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{10:1} = 6\tfrac{1}{4}
$$

Since $\gamma_{9:4}$ is an independent value all immediate successors of $T_{9:4}$ will have initial terms of value greater than 9. The immediate successors of $T_{9:1}, T_{9:2}, T_{9:3}, T_{10:1}$ are

$$
T_{9:1:1} = T_{9:1} + x^3P_2 = -x^{-1}(T_6 + Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:1:1} = 6\tfrac{5}{16}
$$

$$
T_{9:2:1} = T_{9:2} - 2x^4P_2 = 2T_6 + x^{-3}(3P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + Q_2^3 - 3Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:2:1} = 7\tfrac{5}{16}
$$

$$
T_{9:3:1} = T_{9:3} - 2x^5P_2 = 2xT_6 + x^{-2}(P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + 2x^2P_1Q_3 - 2Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:3:1} = 8\tfrac{5}{16}
$$

$$
T_{10:1:1} = T_{10:1} + x^3P_2 = T_{9:1:1}, \quad \text{(redundant)} \qquad \gamma_{10:1:1} = 6\tfrac{5}{16}
$$

Immediate successors of $T_{9:1:1}$ of value less than 9 may only have initial terms $xT_{9:1:1}$ or $T_1T_{9:1:1}$, while $T_{9:2:1}, T_{9:3:1}$ and $T_{10:1:1}$ each have one immediate successor.

$$
T_{9:1:1:1} = xT_{9:1:1} + T_6 = -T_5, \quad \text{(redundant)} \qquad \gamma_{9:1:1:1} = 7\tfrac{1}{3}
$$

$$
T_{9:1:1:2} = T_1T_{9:1:1} + \tfrac{1}{2}T_{9:4} = x^{-2}(-P_2Q_3 + x^4P_3 + x^4P_2Q_2 - \tfrac{1}{2}Q_2^3 - \tfrac{3}{2}Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:1:1:2} = 8\tfrac{7}{12}
$$

$$
T_{9:2:1:1} = T_{9:2:1} - 2T_6 = x^{-3}(3P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + Q_2^3 - 3Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:2:1:1} = 7\tfrac{1}{2}
$$

$$
T_{9:3:1:1} = T_{9:3:1} - 2xT_6 = x^{-2}(P_2Q_2^2 - P_2Q_3 + 2x^2P_1Q_3 - 2Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:3:1:1} = 8\tfrac{1}{2}
$$

$$
T_{10:1:1:1} = T_{10:1:1} - T_{9:1:1} = 0
$$

The only immediate successor of $T_{9:1:1:1}$ is 0. All immediate successors of $T_{9:1:1:2}$ are of value greater than 9. The immediate successors of $T_{9:2:1:1}$ and $T_{9:3:1:1}$ are

$$
T_{9:2:1:1:1} = T_{9:2:1:1} - 3x^6P_1 = x^{-3}(3P_2T_6 - P_2Q_3 + 3x^4P_3 + Q_2^3 - 3Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:2:1:1:1} = 7\tfrac{9}{16}
$$

$$
T_{9:3:1:1:1} = T_{9:3:1:1} - x^7P_1 = x^{-2}(P_2T_6 - P_2Q_3 + x^4P_3 + 2x^2P_1Q_3 - 2Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:3:1:1:1} = 8\tfrac{9}{16}
$$

The only immediate successors of $T_{9:2:1:1:1}$ of value less than 9 has initial term $xT_{9:2:1:1:1}$, while $T_{9:3:1:1:1}$ has only one immediate successor.

$$T_{9:2:1:1:1:1} = xT_{9:2:1:1:1} - \tfrac{3}{2}T_{9:4} = x^{-2}(-P_2Q_3 - \tfrac{1}{2}Q_2^3 - \tfrac{3}{2}Q_2Q_3), \qquad \gamma_{9:2:1:1:1:1} = 8\tfrac{7}{12}$$

$$T_{9:3:1:1:1:1} = T_{9:3:1:1:1} - \tfrac{1}{2}T_{9:4} = x^{-2}(-P_2Q_3 + 2x^2P_1Q_3 - \tfrac{1}{2}Q_2^3 - \tfrac{3}{2}Q_2Q_3), \quad \gamma_{9:3:1:1:1:1} = 8\tfrac{7}{12}$$

Finally, the immediate successors of $T_{9:2:1:1:1:1}$ and $T_{9:3:1:1:1:1}$ are both redundant polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{9:2:1:1:1:1:1} = T_{9:2:1:1:1:1} - T_{9:1:1:2} &= -x^2P_3 - x^2P_2Q_2\\
&= -x^2P_3 - P_3T_1 + x^6P_2 + x^2T_6 - T_1T_5;\\
T_{9:3:1:1:1:1:1} = T_{9:3:1:1:1:1} - T_{9:1:1:2} &= -x^2P_3 + 2P_1Q_3 - x^2P_2Q_2\\
&= -x^2P_3 + 2P_1T_5 - P_3T_1 + x^6P_2 + x^2T_6 - T_1T_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the value semigroup generators of value less than 9 are $1, 1\frac{1}{2}, 2\frac{1}{4}, 3\frac{5}{8}, 4\frac{7}{8}, 6\frac{5}{16}, 7\frac{1}{3}, 7\frac{9}{16}, 8\frac{7}{12}$.

References

[1] S.D. Cutkosky, *Semigroups of valuations dominating local domains*, arXiv:0801.0449.

[2] S.D. Cutkosky, Kia Dalili and Olga Kashcheyeva, *Growth of rank 1 valuation semigroups*, Communications in Algebra 38 (2010), 2768-2789.

[3] S.D. Cutkosky and B. Teissier, *Semigroups of valuations on local rings*, Mich. Math. J. 57 (2008), 173-194.

[4] S.D. Cutkosky and B. Teissier, *Semigroups of valuations on local rings, II*, Amer. J. Math. 32 (2010), no. 5, 1223-1247

[5] S. D. Cutkosky and P. A. Vinh, *Valuation semigroups of two dimensional local rings*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 108 (2014), 350-384.

[6] C. Favre, M. Jonsson, *The valuative tree*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1853, Springer, 2004.

[7] L. Ghezzi and O. Kashcheyeva, *Toroidalization of generating sequences in dimension two function fields of positive characteristic*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 209 (2007), 631-649.

[8] F. G. Herrera Govantes, M. A. Olalla Acosta, and M. Spivakovsky, *Valuations in algebraic field extensions*, J. Algebra 312 (2007), 1033-1074.

[9] F. G. Herrera Govantes, W. Mahboub, M. A. Olalla Acosta, and M. Spivakovsky, *Key polynomials for simple extensions of valued fields* , arXiv:1406.0657.

[10] S. MacLane, *A construction for absolute values in polynomial rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 40 (1936), no. 3, 363-395.

[11] W. Mahboub, *Key polynomials*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 217(2013), no. 6, 989-1006.

[12] M.Moghaddam, *A construction for a class of valuations of the field K(X1,...,Xd,Y) with large value group*, J. Algebra, 319, 7 (2008), 2803-2829.

[13] M. Moghaddam, *Realization of a certain class of semigroups as value semigroups of valuations*, Bulletin of he Iranian Mathematical Society 35, (1) (2009), 61-95.

[14] M. Spivakovsky, *Valuations in Functions Fields of Surfaces*, Amer. J. Math. 112 (1990), 107-156.

[15] B. Teissier, *Valuations, deformations and toric geometry*, Valuation Theory and its Applications II, F.-V. Kuhlmann, S. Kuhlmann, M. Marshall editors, Fields Inst. Comm. 33, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, 361-459.

[16] B. Teissier, *Overweight deformations of affine toric varieties and local uniformization*, arXiv:1401.5204 .

[17] M. Vaquié, *Extension d'une valuation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 359 (2007), 3439-3481.
[18] O. Zariski, P. Samuel, *Commutative Algebra* 2, Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1960.

University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science, 851 S. Morgan (m/c 249), Chicago, IL 60607, USA

E-mail address: `kolga@uic.edu`